



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES




3 3433 07078343 0

JUIN COMMISSION
ON UNIFICATION

VOLUME I



LC





LC

LC

Jc
1

JOINT COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION

OF THE

Methodist Episcopal Church

AND THE

Methodist Episcopal
Church, South


VOLUME I

Proceedings at Baltimore, Md., Decem-
ber 28, 1916—January 2, 1917, and
at Traverse City, Mich.,
June 27–30, 1917

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CHICAGO CINCINNATI

PUBLISHING HOUSE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
NASHVILLE DALLAS RICHMOND

Methodist
Episcopal
Church



COPYRIGHT, 1918
BY
JENNINGS & GRAHAM
AND
SMITH & LAMAR

The proceedings of the Joint Commission have been compiled from the official minutes and from the stenographic report of the speeches as revised by each speaker.

A. W. HARRIS,
FRANK M. THOMAS,
Secretaries.

June 1, 1917.

COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

BISHOPS

Earl Cranston, Chairman, Washington, D. C.
John W. Hamilton, Washington, D. C.
William F. McDowell, Washington, D. C.
Frederick D. Leete, Atlanta, Ga.
Richard J. Cooke, Helena, Mont.

MINISTERS

Edgar Blake, Secretary, Chicago, Ill.
David G. Downey, New York, N. Y.
John F. Goucher, Baltimore, Md.
Robert E. Jones, New Orleans, La.
Albert J. Nast, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Frank Neff, Hutchinson, Kans.
Edwin M. Randall, Seattle, Wash.
Claudius B. Spencer, Kansas City, Mo.
Joseph W. Van Cleve, Chicago, Ill.
John J. Wallace, Pittsburgh, Pa.

LAYMEN

George Warren Brown, St. Louis, Mo.
Charles W. Fairbanks, Indianapolis, Ind.
Abram W. Harris, Secretary, New York, N. Y.
Charles W. Kinne, Jacksonville, Fla.
Irvine G. Penn, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Ira E. Robinson, Charleston, W. Va.
Henry Wade Rogers, New York, N. Y.
William Rule, Knoxville, Tenn.
Alexander Simpson, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rolla V. Watt, San Francisco, Cal.

COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH

BISHOPS

Warren A. Candler, Chairman, Atlanta, Ga.
E. E. Hoss, Muskogee, Okla.
Collins Denny, Richmond, Va.
Edwin D. Mouzon, Dallas, Tex.
W. B. Murrah, Memphis, Tenn.

MINISTERS

Frank M. Thomas, Secretary, Louisville, Ky.
W. J. Young, Atlanta, Ga.
John M. Moore, Nashville, Tenn.
C. M. Bishop, Georgetown, Tex.
E. B. Chappell, Nashville, Tenn.
T. N. Ivey, Nashville, Tenn.
A. F. Watkins, Jackson, Miss.
H. M. Du Bose, Nashville, Tenn.
W. N. Ainsworth, Savannah, Ga.
A. J. Lamar, Nashville, Tenn.

LAYMEN

M. L. Walton, Woodstock, Va.
H. N. Snyder, Spartanburg, S. C.
P. D. Maddin, Nashville, Tenn.
R. S. Hyer, Dallas, Tex.
J. H. Reynolds, Searcy, Ark.
R. E. Blackwell, Ashland, Va.
T. D. Samford, Opelika, Ala.
J. R. Pepper, Memphis, Tenn.
E. C. Reeves, Johnson City, Tenn.
H. H. White, Alexandria, La.

RESERVE MEMBERS

Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Luther B. Wilson, New York City.
Rev. Charles M. Stuart, Evanston, Ill.
James R. Joy, New York City.
Charles Andrew Pollock, Fargo, N. D.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Bishop James Atkins, Waynesville, N. C.
Rev. W. Asbury Christian, Richmond, Va.
Rev. E. V. Regester, Alexandria, Va.
Rev. C. H. Briggs, Sedalia, Mo.
Edward W. Hines, Louisville, Ky.
G. T. Fitzhugh, Memphis, Tenn.

PROCEEDINGS AT BALTIMORE, MD.
DECEMBER 28, 1916
JANUARY 2, 1917



FIRST DAY, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1916

The first session was an open meeting, a devotional session held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md., Thursday, December 28, 1916, at 10 A.M.

Bishop E. E. Hoss, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had charge of this service.

The opening hymn was:

O Thou, who camest from above,
The pure celestial fire to impart.

The Commissioners present, about forty in number, recited the Apostles' Creed, "the confession of our one faith."

Hymn No. 368 was sung:

O love divine, how sweet thou art!
When shall I find my willing heart
All taken up by thee?

Bishop Hoss read the Scriptures—a selection from the fourth chapter of Ephesians, "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called," etc.—making various pertinent comments.

Hymn No. 106 was sung: "O Worship the King, All-Glorious Above."

Bishop Richard J. Cooke offered prayer, after which those present united in singing "A Charge to Keep I Have."

J. F. Goucher: May I inject an item of business that should have attention—namely, that the two Commissions meet separately this afternoon and this evening?

This motion prevailed.

J. F. Goucher: I desire to move further that we authorize the appointment of a committee of ten—one bishop, two ministers, and two laymen, to be selected by each Commission—to serve as a Committee on Organization and Procedure, and that they make report on Friday morning. I do this that the Joint Commission may be able to proceed with its business without further interruptions.

This motion also prevailed.

J. F. Goucher: If it will not cause discussion, I will mention another matter. A number of editors of various periodicals have asked me if I would inquire of the Commission whether the sessions were to be executive. I told them that several members of the Commission had led me to think that that would be their desire. They said they would like to

10 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

know, because they were anxious to determine whether they should remain or not. If your minds are made up, we would relieve their minds by informing them.

R. E. Blackwell: My Conference expressly asked that the proceedings be open.

J. F. Goucher: I withdraw the matter.

The session closed with the benediction pronounced by Bishop E. D. Mouzon.

The Commissioners adjourned to the spacious auditorium of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, where about two hundred persons were assembled.

Bishop McDowell announced, and the congregation sang, the hymn:

Great God! attend, while Zion sings
The joy that from thy presence springs.

The Apostles' Creed was recited, after which Bishop McDowell offered prayer, as follows: Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts, O God, by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit and worthily magnify thy holy name through Jesus Christ our Lord. Prevent us with thy most gracious presence, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy name and finally by thy mercy obtain everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord. We thank thee, O God, that in Jesus Christ thou didst come to us. Through Jesus Christ we come to thee. We thank thee that he has shown us what thou art and rejoice that he ever liveth to intercede for us and that he remembereth our frame, he knoweth that we are dust. We thank thee that in him thou hast spoken to us the word of life, of salvation, of love and redemption. Through him we speak to thee our word of confession, of hope, of prayer, of unutterable longings. O Lord God of Jesus Christ, our God, listen to us again to-day for his name's sake, for we know no other name than the name of Jesus; we speak no other name as we come, and we rejoice that no other name is needed. This name which is high above every name is the all-sufficient name for us to speak. Thou seest us here together, O God, and thou knowest what is in our hearts and our minds and our desires. Thou knowest what is in our purpose and our faith, and thou knowest what is in our fears and our wonder. O God Lord, may we so speak the name of Jesus before thee and so speak the name in our own hearts that light shall fall upon us and grace be given to us, and the wisdom that he has promised and the peace that comes from above, for his name's sake! We do not ask, O God, that any one of us shall have prominence. We do not ask that either of our Churches shall have preëminence. We are not seeking to exalt ourselves or

even our Churches over one another. Here at the beginning we solemnly covenant together to give Jesus Christ the pre-eminence, and him alone. And in all things may he have the preëminence! May we test our thoughts! May we test our speech! May we test our plans! May we test our spirit!

O Lord and the Master of us all,
Whate'er our name or sign,
We own thy sway, we hear thy call,
We test our lives by thine.

God help us from day to day to bear that test! We thank thee for all the way thou hast led us. We thank thee for the good influence of thy rich and abundant mercy and grace. We thank thee for the witness we have been permitted to bear in the earth. We thank thee for the common heritage of faith and experience and for the common achievements in all the world. We cry out in gratitude to thee as we remember that thou hast made us a people which were no people, that thou hast given increase to our poor labors and that thou hast blessed what we tried to do. It is of grace, it is of mercy, it is of unutterable kindness; and we thank thee. We are conscious as we come together to-day, O God, of the great loss that has come to us in this city, in this circle, in these Churches—both of them—in thy holy Church, the whole of it. And we pray thee as we meet that thou wilt bless to us all the memory of that good, great man, so lately gone out of our sight, never to go out of our love and our trust. We thank thee for his love of thy Word and his understanding of it. We thank thee for his matchless preaching of it. We thank thee for his long life and radiant ministry, and we pray that the comfort which thou alone canst give may be given to those who sit in special sorrow to-day, in special triumph to-day, remembering him. And now, O God, bless the word that shall be spoken to us this morning, touching the lips of thy servant as with a live coal from off the altar. Anoint him and anoint us for the speaking and hearing of thy word. We are brothers all in the Lord Jesus Christ, our Elder Brother. We want no will but his will. We want no plans but his plans. We want no triumphs but his triumphs. We want no spirit but his spirit. And this spirit we want in this small circle that reaches out in its meaning to the ends of the earth. And this spirit we want in all the Churches and in all the world. God bless us with the spirit of Jesus Christ! God bless our Churches with the spirit of Jesus Christ and bless our missionaries on the far-flung line with the spirit of Jesus Christ! God bless the world, broken and bruised and burdened, with the spirit of Jesus Christ! Hear us in our prayers. What we say is so small compared with

what we want to say. Our speech is so infirm compared with our desire. May the Spirit which helps our infirmities, the infirmities of our prayers, make intercession for us now, according to the promise! God bless us to-day as in quietness and in reverence we open our hearts to thee! In utter obedience we give our wills to thee. In utter discipleship we submit our minds to thee. Thou art the way, O Master; help us to walk in it. Thou art the truth; help us to know it. Thou art the life; help us to live it. And all this, with the forgiveness of our sins and all other benefits of his passion, we ask in the name of Him in whose name we pray together, saying: "Our Father who are in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen."

Bishop Candler led in the responsive reading of the second Psalm.

After this the Scriptures were read—viz., a selection beginning with the twenty-sixth verse of the thirteenth chapter of Acts.

Bishop Candler: The second hymn is Hymn 611. We have classified it and used it as a funeral hymn. But it is not so much a dirge as a jubilant praise of the whole family of God in heaven and in earth. It will interest us to remember that John Wesley was reading this hymn in a service while Charles Wesley lay dying:

Come, let us join our friends above
That have obtained the prize,
And on the eagle wings of love
To joys celestial rise.

J. F. Goucher: I hold in my hand a copy of the sermon which was preached one hundred and thirty-two years ago day before yesterday by the Rev. Bishop Thomas Coke on the Godhead of Christ, before the Christmas Conference, at the ordination of Bishop Asbury. He spoke for eighty-one Methodist preachers in America, none of them ordained, nearly all of them young men. They represented between fourteen thousand and fifteen thousand members of separate classes. It was a great utterance. It has not ceased to echo in the hearts of the children of men. That occasion was epochal. We have assembled to-day for the first meeting of the Joint Commission on Unification by Reorganization, representing the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The man of God who will address us at this hour speaks to

the twenty-eight thousand ministers and the 6,233,000 communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church; and in a very real sense he will speak also for the forty-four thousand ministers and the 7,850,000 communicants of American Methodism, while the fifty-four thousand ministers and the 9,671,000 communicants of world-wide Methodism and a far larger constituency, including all evangelical Christianity, are deeply interested in this occasion. The Rev. Warren A. Candler, LL.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will preach the opening sermon.

Bishop Candler took as his text Ephesians i. 15-23 and closed by singing Hymn 210:

Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God.

After the singing of this hymn, Bishop Cranston conducted the communion service, in which practically all persons present participated.

The session closed with the benediction.

SECOND DAY, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1916

The morning session, at 10:30 o'clock, was held in the chapel of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore.

Bishop Cranston called the meeting to order.

The hymn, "Blest Be the Tie That Binds," was sung.

J. F. Goucher was called upon to read the Scriptures and said: It is peculiarly appropriate at this opening session that we should remind ourselves of our common spiritual forbears, into whose labors we have entered. We are assembled in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the lineal descendant of Lovely Lane Meetinghouse, in which American Methodism was organized in 1784. This table stood for more than one hundred years in the Alexander Warfield House on Sam's Creek, in the "prophet's chamber," which was occupied very frequently by Bishop Asbury. Beside the "prophet's chamber" was a large closet or small room, where he spent hours in prayer. The Bishop stopped at the Warfield home as he was going south and coming north, to rest his horse, to have his clothes repaired, to catch up with his mail and write up his Journal. Bishop Asbury wrote a very large part of his Journal on this table which stands in front of our presiding officer. Bishops McKendree and Whatcoat and many other worthies also used this table. The chair in which the presiding officer is sitting was made from the black walnut tree under which

14 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

Robert Strawbridge was buried in 1781. The gavel placed here for use this morning was made from the live oak tree under which Mr. Wesley, with some of his fellow voyagers, offered prayer when he first set foot on the soil of America on the bank of the Savannah River, in 1736. In the early days of Methodism there were in Maryland many homes set apart as regular preaching places, each supplied with a pulpit like this one. This pulpit belonged in the home of John Evans, who was a class leader forty-three years and the first recorded Methodist convert in America, converted probably in September, 1763. His home was a regular preaching place for the Methodists from 1768 to 1809, and in the home of John Evans this pulpit was used by Robert Strawbridge for thirteen years; and from it sixty-eight Methodist itinerants, including Strawbridge, Asbury, McKendree, and Whatcoat, preached the word of life. The saddlebags hanging on the arm of the pulpit belonged to Henry Smith, who was closely related to Bishop Soule. I hold in my hand the pocket Bible which belonged to Bishop Coke and which he carried with him in his world-wide traveling. When Bishop Coke was on his way to India, early on the morning of May 5, 1814, his traveling companion found his lifeless body kneeling in his stateroom. This pocket Bible was close beside him, doubtless the last material thing he had grasped while on earth. I deem it eminently appropriate that, standing in the Strawbridge pulpit beside the Asbury table, and using Bishop Coke's pocket Bible, we should read for our Scripture lesson at this opening of the first business session of the Joint Commission on Unification the same lesson which Wesley read at the opening of his ministry in America. John Wesley's Journal records, March 7, 1736:

This day I commenced my ministry in Savannah, and I preached from the lesson for the day, which was the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

We will read for our Scripture lesson the first Scripture lesson which Wesley officially read in America.

Hereupon J. F. Goucher read the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

The first hymn was sung:

O for a thousand tongues to sing
My great Redemer's praise.

Bishop Collins Denny offered prayer: O Lord God most gracious, we come to give thee praise not simply for all thy goodness to us, though we praise thee for thy goodness, but we praise thee for thyself, of which all this goodness is but a man-

ifestation. And we pray thee that, while we shall be willing and glad to give thee praise for thy gifts, we may not forget thee, the Giver. But as we take the gifts and rejoice in the gifts, may we look back through them to the Giver and love thee because of what thou art. We thank thee that thy good hand has been upon us all our days. We praise thee for the training we have had, for the Christian homes in which we were reared, for the Christian examples that were set us by fathers and mothers and ancestors. We thank thee for our heritage; for all the atmosphere of glory with which it comes to us, not only as Methodists, but also as Christians. We thank thee that thou hast led us to this good day. Now what we pray for is that we may have thy guidance. We are not willing to trust ourselves. We are so weak and so subject to prejudice and so easily turned aside from the better things. O Lord, come and take the guidance of each of us, and come and guide this Commission in all its work. And especially do we ask thee, most gracious God, that thy hand may still continue upon thy Church—not simply upon the Church of God in the world, but especially upon the Methodist Church in the world. While we cannot bring back the days of our fathers, we pray thee that we may at least have our own day one that God may bless and honor and approve. While we look back upon the wonderful history, a history in which we rejoice, grant that we may not need to look back upon a better day than the day in which we live. Clothe us with the power of salvation. Give us to speak, we pray thee, with the mighty spirit of the living God. Make our lives the sphere in which there may be manifest that same power which was wrought in Christ when thou didst raise him from the dead. May we be able to say that God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ! And now, Lord, thou dost not need to know aught that we can tell. But we thank thee that thou art willing to hear what we murmur out. But do thou come, we pray thee, and grant to each of us what is best for us out of the richness of thy glory in Christ Jesus. Do thou make the selection, make the choice, of the things each of us most needs and grant those things for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

Bishop Cranston: Brethren, as a matter of privilege I ask your attention for a moment for the reading of a paper.

Brethren of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, before we enter upon the duties with which we are charged by our representative Churches, I beg leave, in behalf of your brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to express to you and to your entire Church our profound sympathy in view of the bereavement that has come upon you

16 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

in the death of your beloved and venerable Senior Bishop, Alpheus W. Wilson. We would have you know how highly Bishop Wilson was esteemed by us, with what intense satisfaction he was received in his many pulpit ministrations among our people, and with what reverence many of us had come to regard him as a man of God and a trusted leader of the great Methodist communion. By many of us he was held in the heart fellowship that knows no conventional lines of separation. We unfeignedly rejoice with you in his majestic manhood, his wonderful attainments in scholarship, his outstanding devotion to evangelical Christianity and in the persistent purpose that made his consecration fruitful to the last day of his more than fourscore years. We shall all miss him here and shall need to pray more that we may be wise because of the absence in body of so wise a counselor. We mourn together, and yet we all rejoice that this stalwart exponent of our common Methodism, who had, like his beloved Paul, fought a good fight and kept the faith, was permitted to finish his course and receive his crown on the field of glorious conquest.

May we join in singing:

Servant of God, well done!
Thy glorious warfare's past;
The battle's fought, the race is won,
And thou art crowned at last.

Of all thy heart's desire
Triumphantly possessed;
Lodged by the ministerial choir
In thy Redeemer's breast.

In condescending love
Thy ceaseless prayer he heard,
And bade thee suddenly remove
To thy complete reward.

With saints enthroned on high,
Thou dost thy Lord proclaim,
And still to God salvation cry,
Salvation to the Lamb!

O happy, happy soul!
In ecstasies of praise,
Long as eternal ages roll,
Thou seest thy Saviour's face.

Redeemed from earth and pain,
Ah! when shall we ascend
And all in Jesus' presence reign
With our translated friend?

Dr. C. M. Bishop offered prayer: O God, the Father of our spirits, we are awed with the sense of thy presence with us. Our hearts recognize thee, O Spirit of the living God, quickening our consciences, stirring us to larger life, giving us the blessed sense of kinship with the divine and the consciousness of immortality. We thank thee that we believe that in thee we live forever. We thank thee that we can and do believe

that our friends and the fathers who have gone before us and those whose spirits have by contact moved our spirits with noble aspirations live on and think on and love on, and that even in the glory that is about the throne itself and in the midst of the rejoicing heavenly life they still carry with them the memory of those whom they loved and of those whom they helped when they wrought among men. And so we thank thee that we believe in the presence with us of our ascended father and brother of whom we think at this moment; that we believe in the presence here, it may be, of the great fathers and founders of the Church which all of us love with all our souls—of Asbury and of Coke and of Strawbridge and the rest of them. These memorials, these mementoes here which our eyes look upon are not so real as are they who dwell in the eternal presence of God and wait continually for the coming of those who can bring good report of the work which they began to do. God bless us in this hour with the spirit of consecration and with the renewed consciousness of the presence of God himself with us, guiding us, overruling, too, if need be, and bringing to pass his own great plans through us, his humble servants! We ask it in Jesus's name.

Bishop J. W. Hamilton prayed: Our Father in heaven and in earth, hear us while we continue to pray. We thank thee that thou art not far away. We do not have to go after thee, but thou art here, even in our hearts and minds. We thank thee that thou art interested in all that we are and all that we do. Nothing is too small to engage thy thought. We are thy servants. We have come to do thy will. We know nothing in the earth beneath nor in the heavens above but that wisdom which comes down from thee, which is pure and gentle and easy to be entreated. We confess our errors of mind and our sins of heart. O, we are sorry for them all. And we desire in thy presence at this hour to be brought so near to thee that there shall be no hindrance to our freest, fullest, candid fellowship in thy name. We desire now to have a consciousness of thy presence in all that we think and say and do. Control our natural temperaments. Inspire our hearts and minds. And may this be a historic hour and a historic week because we build for thee and not for ourselves! O God, help us to look to the sons and daughters that are to come after us! And may we not be fearful to look the future in the face, and yet, sitting in the presence of God, to look him also full in the face, knowing that he knows our hearts and we conceal nothing from him! Now, Lord, breathe upon us all thy Spirit. And may we sit together in the heavenly places in thy name! May we go from here with no regrets for what has been said or done! May the honors of thy Church be a part of thine

everlasting kingdom, which shall never fail until the isles and the uttermost parts of the earth shall know thy presence and will! And the praise of our salvation shall be unto Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, our Saviour, our Lord. Amen.

Bishop Hoss: I arise with such feelings as I have scarcely felt in my lifetime before. I am almost the only man alive of the original Joint Commission on Federation. Many great and good men of both Churches with whom I have been associated in this work have gone on into the kingdom. I have had fellowship with Ninde, who was one of God's sons in the highest sense of the word, a guileless man; with Bishop Merrill, a very different sort of man, but just as much a saint in his own way. I thank God that the saints are not all made out of the same pattern. I never shall forget how one of our lay brothers from Texas succeeded in capturing Bishop Merrill at our first meeting. The Bishop did not like to put his foot down until he knew where it was going. He seemed at first a little doubtful of us. Bishop Ninde, on the other hand, did not appear to know what suspicion or doubt meant. I have had long and intimate association in this Commission with Bishop Walden, who was a straightforward Methodist, unequivocal, who spoke his soul out, and about whose sincerity you could have no misgivings. Of like character was Bishop Granbery, of our own Church, who had the spirit of St. John on him and who wrote the first paper to the Commission. And Bishop Wilson, concerning whom, in the intimacy of close and affectionate friendship that has lasted since 1869—I can truly say he was so much the greatest preacher that I have ever heard that I sometimes doubt whether I have ever heard any man who was really a good second to him. I rise to thank you for this kindly expression concerning our glorified brother. Yet it was an expression you ought to have given, because he belonged to you as well as to us. He was a member of the old Baltimore Conference; and while he came to us in 1866 and was a man of very tenacious convictions—not one of the shallow souls who believe that liberality consists in throwing away convictions—he was a broad-minded and liberal Christian, loving all who loved the Lord. I doubt whether any saint has ever gone into the presence of the Lord since the ascension day who was gladder to look into his face than Bishop Wilson was when the time came for him to have that beatific vision. I cannot avoid a certain feeling of sadness when I look back and think that I am the only man alive of that company. I think there are one or two still alive in your Church who are not here to-day. Judge Murray, who died a few days ago, so I am told, was a man whom we all loved very much. I think that Judge Clark, from our Church, of the North Carolina Supreme Court, is

still alive. Apart from these, I do not know of any others. I am glad to be here this morning. How long I am going to stay I cannot tell, but I am not much concerned about that. I came to the conclusion many years ago that the traveling is just as safe on the other end of the road as it is on this. I shall hope to meet on the other side these dear brethren who have gone before. Since our last full meeting of the Commission Dr. Miller has gone away. He was twenty-four carats fine. I find great comfort in looking back and remembering the fact that I have never had an unkind word from any of these brethren nor spoken an unkind word to any of them. They did not require me always to agree with them. If they had, I should not have done it, because I did not always agree with myself. But I thank God for the one Church above, beneath, the good men who have gone before, whom I shall meet by and by, for the good men whom I shall leave behind when I go. I am not an atrabilious saint nor a pessimist. I do not think God's Church is going to die simply because these great men have left it. Jesus Christ has not yet vacated his throne and is not going to do it overnight. Blessed be God for his abounding grace! I am glad to see you all again, brethren. I hope I won't do anything this time that will alienate any of you. My brethren in the Lord have had great forbearance, have been very gentle with me, for which I thank them. I am glad to be here. I am sorry I could not have been at Bishop Wilson's funeral, but I was holding a Conference in Louisiana and could not have got here if I had traveled every hour after hearing of his death. And he would have said: "O, no, Brother Hoss, don't do that; do your duty." That is what he himself always did. The last time I saw him he was in the library at Emory University and had got down from the shelf a very valuable copy of the Greek Testament. That was characteristic of him. He did not merely read the blessed Book by snatches. He was at it every morning. He did not make a five-minute matter of his devotions. I have been around with him at Conferences and stayed in the same room with him. He would get down his Hebrew Psalter and his Greek Testament every morning and plunge into them for a half hour or more. In winter time I have seen him throw a cloak over his shoulders and kneel down and spend a half hour in prayer. I thank you for this very tender tribute which you have offered him, your brother and ours, one of God's kings and saints, now exalted to the right hand on high. I never shall forget that sermon which he preached from "They that overcome shall sit down with him on his throne." He said: "They shall not sit at the foot of his throne, but on his throne,

in closest association with him." O that we may all come to that high place!

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Brethren, I think we are all impressed, more than ever before, perhaps, that this is worth while. We are ready to consider what the essence of Methodism is. I am glad that Bishop Hoss has taken the time he has occupied in speaking. It reminds me of the day in Chattanooga when Bishop Wilson, overcome by his infirmities, was about taking leave of us. As he stood leaning on his cane he gave us as patriarchal an admonition and exhortation as I ever heard. He was a wonderful man, a rebuke to all of us of weak will, a rebuke to many of us younger men who fancy that our strength is so easily exhausted and that we owe ourselves so much rest and recreation. I met him in New York when he was in severe suffering. I said: "Bishop, do come over to the hospital in Brooklyn." He said: "No, I will go on with my work, and I think I will go home this afternoon." That was his temper. And from such fathers we may learn lessons of application as well as of faith, of industry as well as of zeal. Now, brethren, I presume it is my duty to call for the report of the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

Bishop McDowell: Mr. Chairman, I would suppose that the first act would be the calling of the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Is that your order?

Bishop McDowell: I think we did not present that order, but it should come before the report of the Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Chair does not feel that he has the right to suggest any order in the absence of the Committee. He does not know whether he is in the chair or not.

Bishop McDowell: I move that the Secretaries of the two Commissions proceed to call the roll.

The roll was called and showed as present nineteen Commissioners from the Methodist Episcopal Church and twenty-four from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I am reminded of a matter of common interest to us. We are all of us concerned about the proposed monument to Bishop Asbury, which it is expected Methodism will erect in the city of Washington. We have an Asbury Association, as you know, in which all the branches of Methodism, so far as they were responsive, are represented, and already there has been prepared a tentative plan for the structure. A picture of it has been published in the papers. That was rather premature. There has been some criticism in regard to it. There is no body which could settle

what would be acceptable to the most of our preachers and people as well as this body can. The Association feels like asking your advice in regard to it. The artist was in Washington not long ago and expressed his willingness to come here, bringing the model that had been his conception. There is a difference between the appearance of things in the model and in the print. He expressed a willingness to bring also a revised sketch of the figure of Asbury. The authorities in Washington—that is, the Art Commission to which has been committed by the government the final decision in regard to what monuments or memorials shall be allowed a place on public grounds—were quite averse to an equestrian statue. But we pleaded the case as best we could, that Asbury without his horse would not be typical of the Methodist itinerant of the early days; and they finally accepted this representation and have assigned us, subject to the action of Congress, a very beautiful site in the neighborhood of two Methodist churches. I think it is the most desirable in the whole city. Still that must go through Congress, and we may need your help. It may come to this, that we shall have to buy a site. The artist can be here on Monday. If you see fit to give him a half hour's time for the presentation of his ideas and the showing of any sketch he may have, I think perhaps it would be to the great satisfaction of the whole Church. Certainly it would be to the satisfaction of those of us who have been charged with this matter. Do you wish to do that?

J. F. Goucher: Personally I hope not. The purpose is to have this equestrian statue so designed as to serve for a monument to this pioneer, not only of American Methodism, but of our civilization and our nation, and placed in a very prominent position in Washington City. All this is worthy of hearty coöperation. But this is not the work of, nor has it been referred to, this Commission. The matter committed to us is of such tremendous moment, there is so much involved, the General Conferences expressed themselves with such enthusiasm concerning it when they submitted it to this Commission, and the Churches are so expectant, that we ought not to interrupt our meditations or in any wise interfere with the specific business which has been assigned to us, however admirable the object asking our attention may be. I fear this would prove to be a precedent if we are not careful. Personally, I would express an intense desire that nothing whatever should be injected into our proceedings that can in anywise subordinate for a moment the unification idea, the straightforward movement of thought, and the accomplishment of the matters committed to us.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I take it that what the

22 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

Commission proposed is directly in line with the recognition we have been giving to the fathers and that there is no one thing that can come to us in which we are all so concerned as this. That is all I have to say about it, and it is with the Joint Commission to determine whether they will give any time to it or not and whether, if you do not care to give the time out of the sessions, you will give it in the recess hour between sessions. Methodism is committed to this matter. We have got to raise forty to fifty thousand dollars and are not doing it very rapidly. We shall have either to drop the matter or to go ahead more actively.

Bishop Hamilton: I sympathize with what Dr. Goucher has said and suggested to the committee, when they wrote to me about it, that I suspected it would not be agreeable to the Commission to have this matter presented in one of our meetings and that the meeting of the committee which they proposed to hold could be held at some time here in the city near by, where informally the Commission could call upon the committee, if you please, to see this statue and make our criticisms or suggestions. I suggested that a meeting be called for Saturday or Monday and conference be had with some one here as to a suitable hour when we could look in on the committee and make our suggestions.

Bishop Hoss: I think that we can get to this matter quickly by simply setting aside a half hour to meet the gentleman and be done with it. I fully sympathize with the spirit of Dr. Goucher in this matter, but I move that we designate a half hour on Monday.

This was seconded and carried.

John M. Moore: Why not say 2 P.M., either at the Rennert Hotel or at the place where we will meet on Monday?

J. F. Goucher: I am very much annoyed that you are not more comfortable here. The chirography of all men is not equally plain. The Sunday school entertainment was arranged for Tuesday, but it was printed "Thursday." That occupies the room above, where we should be sitting now. But they did not get it cleaned out in time. Arrangements have been made for you to meet in the chapel of the Mount Vernon Place Church, beginning with this afternoon's session, if agreeable to you.

John M. Moore: I suggest, then, the chapel of the Mount Vernon Place Church at two o'clock Monday.

This was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Let us hear from the Committee.

Bishop Denny presented the report of the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

FIRST REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION
AND PROCEDURE

BALTIMORE, December 29, 1916.

Chairman of the two Commissions.

Your Committee on Organization and Procedure recommend that the rules of the Cape May Commission, modified as follows, be adopted:

I. The Joint Commission shall hold its sessions in Mount Vernon Place Methodist Episcopal Church at such times as may be determined by the chairmen of the Commissions.

II. The Chairmen of the respective Commissions shall preside at all sessions of the Joint Commissions in alternation, and the Secretaries of the two Commissions shall act conjointly as Secretaries of the sessions of the said Commission.

III. In view of the greatness of the responsibility imposed upon us and in view of our utter dependence upon divine guidance in a matter of so much importance, a half hour shall be spent in earnest prayer at the commencement of each daily session of the Commission.

IV. All resolutions, propositions, and reports shall be submitted in writing signed by the member or members offering the same.

V. No action of the Joint Commission shall be deemed valid unless by a majority vote of each Board of Commissioners.

VI. The deliberations of said Commission shall be governed by the ordinary rules of deliberative bodies.

VII. The deliberations of the Joint Commission shall be in secret session, and its proceedings shall not be disclosed till final action shall have been taken and officially promulgated except by order of the Joint Commission.

VIII. Votes of the Joint Commission shall be taken by yeas and nays whenever three members of the Joint Commission shall request it.

We also recommend:

IX. That all speeches and motions shall be limited to ten minutes.

X. That no one shall speak twice until all who desire shall have spoken.

We recommend that Bishop Earl Cranston preside at this morning's session of the Joint Commission.

We recommend that the hours of the sessions of the Joint Commission be fixed as follows: Morning, 9:30 to 12:30; afternoon, 2:30 to adjournment.

We recommend that all committees shall be chosen from the two Commissions by the Commissions themselves unless otherwise ordered.

We recommend the following Order of Procedure, following the devotional service, for the morning session:

1. Presentation of the action of the Joint Commission on Federation adopted at Chattanooga, Tenn., May 10, 1911.

2. Presentation of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Oklahoma City in May, 1914.

3. Presentation of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga Springs in May, 1916.

4. Statement from each Commission of the powers and duties imposed upon it by the action of its own General Conference.

5. That we consider the action of each of the General Conferences seriatim, to ascertain the points of divergence and the points of agreement between the action of the two General Conferences, and particularly the points of divergence from the tentative agreement at Chattanooga.

6. Consideration of standing committees.

COLLINS DENNY, *Chairman*;
EDGAR BLAKE, *Secretary*.

24 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

The report was taken up item by item, and all the items were adopted unanimously except Item VII., on which debate proceeded as follows:

R. E. Blackwell asked whether that item would allow the editors of our Church papers to be present at the meetings of the Joint Commission and moved that they be allowed to be present, but that nevertheless the meetings be considered secret and nothing be printed in the papers unless authorized by the body. This motion was seconded.

Bishop Candler: I hope the motion will not prevail. I think it is unprecedented in meetings of this kind and would be likely to lead to embarrassment. I do not mean to depreciate the importance of the Church press. I am a reformed journalist myself. But men are men, and we may get diversities of impressions made. We have a very serious, solemn, important mission to accomplish here. I hope we shall not have publication of any kind or the possibility of publication of any kind except by the direct authority of this Commission.

T. N. Ivey: We have three members of this Commission who are editors of official papers in the two Methodisms. There are several editors of our official papers who are very anxious to keep up with the proceedings of this body and who, I think, should keep up with the proceedings in order that they may discharge their responsibility before their people. The people of our various constituencies are expecting to know something of what is going on. Of course these brethren do not expect to give out anything that they could not give out with the authority of this body. They are discreet men. I trust that an exception will be made in the case of these editors.

Bishop Hamilton: I suspect that what my brother over there meant was the papers of both Churches. This is a Joint Commission. The question immediately arose in my mind: What papers? You say: "Our papers." Now, we have in this city a paper the editor of which would very much desire to be present in this session. It is not an official paper. The same thing is true of several other papers like the *Northern Christian Advocate*. When you say "our Advocates," I think it will be necessary for us in some way or other to specify what papers shall be represented. Some of them are semisecular. I certainly sympathize with Bishop Candler that you do not want the secular papers represented here, because they desire those things that we do not desire to have put into the papers. I rise, therefore, to inquire as to the meaning, that we may know which papers are included. I think it ought to be so designated that, if courtesy be extended to any, it shall certainly be extended to the papers in this city.

Bishop Hoss: I hope that this motion will not prevail. When our work is done, we must give it the widest possible publicity. But what impression will be made on the Church if we send forth what we do or proposed to do at our several stages? I do not want anything published until I have a chance to look at the manuscript and make myself say in it what I wish I had said. It is a mistake to suppose that publicity is the same as a stream of constant talk. This matter was brought up in our Southern Commission. Reference was made to the Constitutional Convention in 1787. We never could have got a Constitution then if we had had a lot of newspaper reports in that body. I have been on many Commissions of one sort and another from the Church, and we have never let just anybody in. I have been kept out myself, once from the Board of Church Extension very abruptly; and that was not as important a matter as this. We do not want anything published until we have matured our work and reached our conclusion. We will appear before the public as having done a dozen distinct and contradictory things if we allow publication to be made before we are through. I do not want the brethren in here with their newspapers. Let us go quietly about this. We don't want any hurrah and sensationalism. Somebody has published some speeches I made in the Commission on Federation. It was resolved by that Commission that not a word should be published until the manuscript had been submitted to the original speakers. I do not know who published these. I know they did not pick my best speeches. The picking was evidently done with design and forethought. It had a definite purpose in view. If it had been given out while we were still deliberating, it would have raised a good deal of disturbance. Bishop Cranstion came with his speech already written. I made mine extemporaneously and afterwards wrote it out. I hope we will go along quietly, without newspaper disturbance.

T. N. Ivey: I did not say that I was in favor of admitting any one who would give the proceedings of this body to the public. I have confidence in these brethren. It is due these brethren that they know what is going on. In the meeting at Chattanooga I was admitted to the meetings. I did not publish a line in the *Christian Advocate* concerning this meeting. I have been abused since for not giving to the public those resolutions when I knew that I was instructed and everybody else was instructed to keep those things quiet until the General Conference. I did not think the original mover of the motion meant, and I am sure that I do not mean, to intimate that there shall be any publication of the proceedings here. I believe we can trust these discreet brethren.

C. M. Bishop: Why should editors alone be invited? Why not other distinguished members of the two Churches? That has been the custom before. Visitors have been welcome, but they have come in with the understanding that they were under the responsibility which courtesy and good faith imposed. If the motion were that the body might invite representatives from either Church, and that we might allow them to sit as visitors, I should be in favor of it. I am not in favor of singling out editors and extending to them an invitation which will be a sort of suggestion that they give out to the public what we are doing here. I should not be in favor of imposing so strict a secrecy as that no visitor representing our Churches should be allowed to be present.

F. M. Thomas: I make a motion, growing out of my experience as Secretary of the Joint Commission for the past six years. If I can get a second to it, I will speak to it. I move that the motion that the session be secret be amended by adding the words "unless otherwise ordered."

This was seconded.

F. M. Thomas: I think it would be a mistake to open this body to even the editors as a class, though from time to time we have seated, as the records here show, the editors of papers. I think this body ought to reserve to itself at any time the right to permit some present if it so deems best—not the representatives of any class, but especial men. Our trouble the past few years has not been with the editors of newspapers, but with the members of the Commission themselves. I do not know that I have much more faith in members of the Commission as a class than in presiding elders. I have known the bishops to swear the presiding elders solemnly to secrecy, and you would hear the thing on the street the next morning before Conference assembled. I have here a copy of the minutes of the Commission marked "Private Copy." I sent it out to members of the Commission, requesting them to keep it sacred and secret. In less than two months it appeared in a California newspaper and then in a religious journal in Kentucky, when it was intended that the matter should be kept for confidential information of members of the Commission. There is not half so much danger from a wise newspaper man whom we might trust as from some member of the Commission who would "leak." Therefore I think that we need to hold this privilege with ourselves and not absolutely close our doors. We might deem it wise sometime to seat somebody whom we can trust. Therefore I move that amendment, "unless otherwise ordered."

Bishop Candler: Mr. Chairman, I hope the report of the Commission will prevail. I sympathize with the view ex-

pressed by Dr. Bishop when he said: "If you admit them, admit others." I do not believe we sit here as world diplomats, but I do think there is some analogy between diplomatic meetings between civil governments and our meeting. I never heard of men meeting to form a treaty and calling a whole nation to observe the various stages of their negotiations. As far as I can gather, the gentlemen who are dealing with Mr. Carranza have not invited visitors or representatives of the press to attend their meetings. I do not think there is any precedent for it. I judge these customary methods of the commissions of nations rest on some essential wisdom. It is better for the results desired to be achieved that our sessions should not be open. I think perhaps for just one class of men we might qualify the rule. If any alternate member of the Commission, who has been appointed to take the place of any principal delegate who may fail to attend, should be here, we might admit him, because alternates may be called to serve. In a sense they are supernumerary members of the Commission. But if you open the doors to editors, educators also might come in, and many others with equal propriety. I would like to have some judges I know, for example, because a judge does keep counsel well. Still I do not want any judge here unless he be a member of the Commission.

W. J. Young: When the members of our Commission were selected, we selected certain alternate members. One of them is present and would like to be permitted to attend the sessions of this body. I mention that in connection with Bishop Candler's statement. I fully agree with the position he has taken on that subject.

George Warren Brown: I am in favor of having our sessions executive, and I think that what Brother Thomas has spoken about our own members being possibly guilty in times past in giving out matter that should not be given out can be avoided if every individual on this Commission will give the fullest appreciation to the sacredness of his responsibility. I think this a time when we are on the King's business. Every man should feel the sacredness of his responsibility in not giving out anything except what should be given out by a publicity committee which can be appointed to give out what should be given out. I think that those members of this Commission who are editors should be put in the same relation as all other editors and have the opportunity to give out simply what this publicity committee decides proper to give out.

A. W. Harris: I favor the motion of Dr. Blackwell. The people of the Churches have a right to know the work of this Joint Commission, and they must come to know it, for the

most part, through our papers. Our editors will represent our work better if they are in touch with it as it goes on. It is inevitable that reports of this meeting will be published; the editors must publish something. I think it manifestly better to trust them and let them have the facts. Furthermore, we have three editors now present by rights which no one may challenge. It is probable that two more will be admitted. The others are also trustworthy. When I have taken newspaper men into my confidence, I have made no mistake; when I have refused to take them into my confidence, I have sometimes suffered from their imagination. A word with reference to the document referred to here. It was not published, but reduplicated for the information of members of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church and, for cheapness' sake, printed instead of typewritten. Not a single copy was given to any person not a member of the Commission, except that as a matter of courtesy and on request and with the approval of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church I furnished twenty-five copies for the use of the members of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

John M. Moore: I was the man through whom these copies were given to members of the Southern Commission. I asked for a copy, and Dr. Harris sent me a copy. Then I asked him if he would give a copy to each member. That is how they happened to come into our hands. I favor the motion offered by Dr. Blackwell, because I think that the rule should be adopted. I indorse the rule as read by the Committee, which says that the sessions shall be secret and nothing be given out except by order of the Commission. It seems to me that these men might be brought in under that resolution. They come in here; they are on their honor, just as the other editors who are members of this Commission are on their honor as to what shall be given out. If we bring these men in and put them on their honor to abide by the desires of this Commission, I think there will be no trouble whatever; and they can give the information to the Church which we want given to the Church, and they will be in a position to give it to the Church. I think it will be well for these editors to sit with us under the rule.

Bishop Denny: The Committee gave careful consideration to this rule. I think they talked it over at greater length than any other rule presented to you. The Committee was unanimous in recommending this rule. While it is true that sooner or later what is done here will go out, with greater or less accuracy, the question is, Can we do our work so well unless we have secret meetings? We must hold either a secret meet-

ing or an open meeting. You cannot make it partly secret and partly open. You say you want to cut off the secular press. Sometimes the best reports we have are from the secular press. It is quite natural that these brethren who came to Baltimore should have the curiosity to know what is going on in here. It is human nature. There is nothing abnormal in that. But, brethren, we are sent here for the first time to deal with some very delicate matters, points of grave difference. Anything that we can do to save complication increases the prospect of a successful issue. Anything we do that is likely to complicate will be an obstacle to the result that we are sent here to try to achieve. The Committee believed that we could meet better the responsibilities that the Church has laid upon us by having our meetings secret meetings. Unanimously they make that recommendation. As a matter of course, we could comply at any time, simply by a vote, with the suggestion made by Dr. Thomas and have an open meeting. But the question is now whether we intend to have an open meeting or a closed meeting, and the Committee unanimously recommends a closed meeting.

Edgar Blake: It is true that this particular rule received more consideration than any other of the eight. It is also true that there was no discussion whatever, as I now recall, upon any other rule and very little upon this one. While the action taken was unanimous—that is, so far as any vote was concerned—it is not in entire accord with the facts in the sense that all of us in our own minds were persuaded that this action—

Bishop Denny: Were there any votes against it?

Edgar Blake: I do not recall that there were any votes, after discussion in detail or at any great length. I confess I find myself very much in sympathy with the purpose of the motion made—the original motion made. I am not so concerned that there shall be undue publicity given to our deliberations as I am concerned that what publicity is given shall correctly represent the spirit and action of this body. We might just as well face the fact that the Church is anxious for a knowledge of the proceedings here—not in all the details, perhaps, but they want to know how the Commission is getting along. And it is up to the Church editors to give some report of this meeting. And they will do it. My judgment is that it is vastly better that these editors should get their facts and their impressions from inside the body than from rumors that come to them outside the sessions. I think we may be more accurately interpreted if we permit them to sit with us. And there is another item that appeals to me more strongly than that—namely, when this Commission has completed its delib-

erations, and if it shall reach a conclusion that it wants to send down to our Annual Conferences, we might as well make up our minds to this fact, that the agency through which the Church at large, our ministry and our laity, upon whom will rest the final decision and determination of these matters—that the education and the instruction of this larger constituency through our Church will be effected through the agency of the Church press. Now, it seems to me that our Church press will be in a much better position to interpret intelligently and accurately the proceedings and decisions of this body if they sit with us and hear our discussions. My judgment is that had some editors of our own Church press (I refer now solely to the Methodist Episcopal Church)—if certain of our editors had sat through some of the deliberations of the Joint Commission on Federation, much misinformation and misinterpretation that have confused the mind of the Church would have been prevented entirely. And, therefore, in the interest of reasonable publicity, in the interest of accurate interpretation, I think it is highly desirable that the editors of our Church press should be permitted to sit with us during our deliberations. Now, I am not quite clear that the wisest thing to do is to make a blanket resolution and admit all editors of all Church papers. I am fairly clear in my own mind, however, that we could very wisely take the case of each editor upon its own merits—that is to say, when an editor is present at the sessions. I do not intend to make any discrimination. I am perfectly willing for the blanket resolution or would be glad to take a half loaf if we cannot get a whole one. In other words, when an editor is present, as several editors are present at this session, let the Commissioners of the Church which they represent present the request before the body that they may sit with the body, and let the body act upon the requests that come to it. Personally I hope that something will be done to admit the editors of our Church press to our sittings.

Bishop Mouzon: I should like to inquire as to the content and purpose of the motion made by Dr. Blackwell. If I understand him, possibly one reason why he offers this motion is because the Virginia Conference, in resolutions passed touching unification, suggested that the Commission hold open sessions. I have been wondering why the Virginia Conference desires that the Commission hold open sessions; also why brethren were so anxious that what we say and do here should immediately get to the ear of our people. I think that I am entirely willing that everything that I do and say here should, if necessary, be known by my people, by the people of America. I do not know, however, that the thought that what I am saying or doing is to come

immediately to the Church would make me any more careful than I am going to be. However that may be, I am quite sure that this motion is very unwise. Our people are very much concerned. They have sent us here to do something, not to do nothing. They have sent us here to inquire whether or not we can find a way whereby Methodism in America may be unified. They have not sent us here to discuss ways and means whereby it may be done. And, as I said, our people are very much concerned. They are much more concerned in some quarters than in others and much more concerned than some brethren know them to be. If everything that we say here, or if much that we say here should immediately get to our people, I am very much afraid that telegrams and letters would begin to come to us in large numbers. I am afraid we should cause confusion in some places. One benefit of public speech is that the speaker thereby clarifies his own thinking. Very frequently we do that by speaking. It is altogether likely that some things we say at the beginning will not harmonize precisely with some things that we are going to say at the conclusion. I do not think that any of you differ from me in that regard. That is one advantage in speaking. Now, if we give processes out to our people, they are not going to be benefited by that. They are not interested in processes; they are interested in the results of this meeting. I certainly hope that just as soon as possible, as soon as we have come to conclusions, we shall give results to our people. But we shall only confuse them, we shall not help the Church, if we give processes. I confess I view the motion with deep concern and also with some alarm.

J. F. Goucher: It is not the habit of deliberative bodies to create commissions for ordinary questions. But when a deliberative body recognizes a question as of such vital importance that it should have most careful and continued consideration, demanding adjustments and readjustments of thought and attitude because of the varying and developing relationships of the complex problem, it is the habit of deliberative bodies to appoint special commissions to do that work. The two General Conferences having thought it wise by special appointment to select a Commission of fifty, with instructions to consider and report upon the great questions committed to this Commission, I assume it to be a very grave responsibility, and we ought not, in my judgment, in any way to avoid or evade the responsibility that has come to us. Therefore I think that we ought not to admit any class of persons or any one to this body unless, in the judgment of the body, that person may be the custodian of some extraordinary knowledge or ability which can throw light upon some of our vexed questions of which the body itself is not possessed. The General Conferences did not contemplate the

editors bearing testimony, conclusions, or arguments primarily from this body to the Church. But this Commission was to report. Therefore I must stand squarely with the report of the Committee that the meetings shall be secret. In that way I think our deliberations will be of very much more consequence. Bishop Mouzon has said, better than I could have said, what was in my mind, that I dare say there is not one of us who will make at the later meetings of the Commission the speeches he would make now. I am trying to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord daily. I am sure that when I have heard the illuminating speeches of some of our brethren here my attitude may be changed. My thinking may be mobilized. I should therefore prefer that the discussions, so far as I may take part in them, should not be reported to the Church until we reach the final conclusions upon the subjects committed to us to consider and report upon.

R. E. Blackwell: There is no antagonism between my motion and everything said here about the meetings being secret and private. I want, and shall always want, private secret meetings. But I do not mean to say that when we allow these gentlemen to come in they are to publish what they see fit.

Bishop Hoss: What are they to be here for, then?

R. E. Blackwell: Because they must interpret our action to the people whom we desire to have a proper interpretation of our action. I think if they are here to get the processes, they will be better able to interpret them than if they hear only what may leak out, for they will find out how we are talking. It is no violation at all of the principle of what the Committee has brought in that these gentlemen sit with us. The meetings shall be secret; and we ask these gentlemen, editors of official organs of the two Churches, to sit with us. I do not propose, and I am sure those who have spoken for the resolution do not propose, that these editors shall give out through their papers any more than the editors now present feel that they shall have the right to give out through their papers the various deliverances just as they come from us at this meeting. They will be bound by the same rule that the editors here present are bound by. Therefore the motion is not at all a violation of the principle of the resolution brought in by the Committee.

C. W. Fairbanks: Only a very brief word. I had not intended to say anything. I feel the responsibility of my presence here upon the invitation of my Conference. I have come with a very profound hope that the Commission can reach an agreement. Of course it is at once obvious that there are a large number of points more or less of difference, but I think there is a very general desire that we should come to some general conclusion. I understand that when the Commission reaches

conclusions they are reduced to writing. It is thought by some that it is necessary for accurate future judgment that we shall have interpreters of our proceedings present in the person of editors. I do not like that thought. I think it would be unfortunate if we were to formulate anything here which we could not clearly interpret except through the aid of visiting editors. My belief is that the work of the Commission will be expedited in time and assured of clarity when it is done, not in a town meeting fashion, but in the privacy of a council chamber. There is not one of us who is not open-minded. I certainly have no preconceived notion with respect to the details of procedure. I have very fixed views with respect to my desire as to the ultimate results. Anything I can do or anything I can refrain from doing which will aid the results I am perfectly free to say I will freely do or not do. Now, I know how difficult it is to preserve the privacy even of a small council. I have had some little experience in the public service. It has taught me that the private things are the ones that become soonest public. The executive proceedings of the United States Senate are, under the fixed rules of that august assembly, to be kept in absolute confidence. It is quite common to get an accurate report outside the Senate Chamber before the deliberations are actually concluded within. Now, my thought, to be brief, is this: that we will promote ultimate accuracy by reserving to this official Commission the responsibility of spreading its record of what is done before the public in its own way and in its own time. I am most heartily in accord with the resolution as reported by the Committee. I would like to see the report adopted. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

H. M. Du Bois: This question does not need further discussion or illumination. I have risen to observe that we are here to discuss and effect great plans, history-making plans. The hearts of us all are hungry to get at the heart of this matter. I most respectfully call for the vote, Mr. Chairman. I move the previous question.

It was ordered that the main question be put.

The vote was taken on Dr. Thomas's substitute, which was to amend the report of the Committee by inserting the words "unless otherwise ordered by the Commission." This amendment was lost.

The vote was taken on Dr. Blackwell's amendment, and it did not prevail.

The rule, as reported by the Committee, was adopted.

The other items of the report were read and adopted.

Bishop Hoss: I want to know whether the Commissions are to meet separately.

34 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

Bishop McDowell: By any process which each one may devise. It was felt that the Chairman of our Commission ought not to pick the persons who should constitute the committees.

With reference to the matter of taking up the items seriatim D. G. Downey said: "The purpose was to find our points of agreement and divergence. It was not intended that we should take them up for final adjudication at this time."

Bishop McDowell: The object in having presented the three documents referred to, the action of the General Commission at Chattanooga and the action of the two General Conferences, was to get each of these documents into the record of this meeting. They are all printed in the *Christian Advocate* this week. The object of their presentation here was to get each of them into the proceedings here this morning, just to have them before us.

Bishop Denny: Then Brother Downey has correctly stated the purpose of that fifth recommendation that we consider the action of the General Conferences seriatim—that is, a statement from the Chairman of each Commission of the points at which we agree and the points at which there is divergence, so that they can come sharply before us.

Bishop Candler: There are some reserve delegates on the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Perhaps the same method has been adopted in the Methodist Episcopal Church. These brethren ought to be of use, in case they should be called to active membership in the Commission. It seems to me that it would be well for them to sit with us. I move that any such reserve delegates from either Church be allowed to sit with the Commission, without power to discuss or vote.

Bishop Hamilton: Of course where there is a vacancy the reserve ought to be voted in by the Commission to take the place of the principal. Therefore we want to include the opportunity to vote that brother in.

Bishop Candler: That belongs to the separate Commissions.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Possibly we ought to have the same view of what constitutes a member or a reserve member of the Commission. It was the decision of our Commission that there must be a resignation before we are entitled to call to the session a reserve.

Bishop Hoss: Who appointed your Commissioners?

Bishop McDowell: They were appointed by the General Conference upon nomination of the bishops.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think the General Conference authorized the bishops to appoint.

Bishop Candler: I think this Joint Commission will be entirely satisfied if the Commission from either Church reports that a certain man is a *bona fide* member of the Commission.

Bishop McDowell: Also Bishop Candler is right in this, that these persons who have been officially chosen, by the processes under which each Commission acts, to be reserve members, alternates, should be recognized by the Joint Commission before being permitted to sit in it. In the event of any of our reserve delegates being present at this or at the seat of any future session, I am sure that the provision that they be permitted to sit here without right to speak or vote and subject to the same limitations as the rest of us would be a wise one.

F. M. Thomas: The privilege to sit means that and nothing more.

The motion as to the seating of alternates prevailed.

On motion of Bishop Candler, the report as a whole was adopted.

J. F. Goucher: In March, 1816, Bishop Asbury died in Virginia. On May 9 his remains were brought to Baltimore. On May 10 the funeral occurred, and his remains lay in state in the Light Street Church and, after the funeral exercises, were taken to Eutaw Street Church and deposited in a vault under the pulpit of that church. It is said that in the city of Baltimore, small as it was at that time, from twenty to twenty-five thousand people followed those remains to the place of their deposit. By action of the General Conference of 1852 the remains were authorized to be transferred to Mount Olivet Cemetery, Baltimore; and in 1854 the remains were deposited in that cemetery. It seems to me we would be in harmony with the purpose of giving proper honor during this centennial of the death of Bishop Asbury if we as a body should go to his grave and show our respect, recognize our obligation, and interpret our affection by a prayer service. If it be agreeable to the Commission, I should be very glad to have automobiles at your command to take us out there for that service. It would take but little time. I bring this matter to your attention, pleased to accept whatever may be your decision.

Bishop Denny: Could we hold the prayer service there at 3:30 Sunday afternoon?

J. F. Goucher: At your pleasure. You will stand there by the graves of Strawbridge, Asbury, George, Waugh, Emory, Jesse Lee, and many others of whose devotion we are the heirs. There are over two hundred graves of Methodist preachers in Mount Olivet Cemetery.

Bishop Denny: I move that we hold such a service, leaving the hotel at three o'clock.

Bishop Cooke: Is there not a program for Sunday afternoon?

J. F. Goucher: The Committee has no program arranged. By the suggestion of the subcommittee arranging for the preliminaries every member of the Commission was requested to ab-

stain from making any personal arrangements for Sunday and to leave himself in the hands of the Committee representing the three Methodisms of Baltimore for assignment; also to abstain from any engagements Sunday evening, so that the entire Commission might unite in a watch night service Sunday night. If the Commissioners have observed that request, there is no obligation for which the Committee is responsible.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): A matter of privilege. I had an interview with President Wilson three or four days ago and in conversation referred to the fact that this Commission on Unification was to meet here in Baltimore this week. I expressed my feeling that it would be agreeable to the members of the Commission to be received by the President and have their mission in this part of the country recognized and hear from him such remarks as it might please him to offer. He took the matter under advisement immediately, saying very graciously that he would of course be happy to receive the Commission. I have a letter from him this morning saying that he might not be able to minister to edification—that is, to speak directly upon what we have in hand. From the tone of the letter, I think he would be pleased to meet us and willing to say what might be in his mind as appropriate, befitting his public station.

A. W. Harris: I move that the Chairman be authorized to make suitable arrangements for the call on the President at such time as he may find convenient.

This motion prevailed.

Bishop Denny: There is a matter that ought not to be passed in silence, partly because of historic importance, also because of precedent, and chiefly because of the principle involved. On page 9 of these privately printed "Minutes of the Joint Commission on Federation" it is recorded that "Bishop A. W. Wilson moved that the stenographic reports of our meeting be written out in full, verified by the speakers, and preserved in the archives of the Commission." This resolution was adopted. I was greatly surprised last night to learn that here had been printed part of the addresses delivered by the members of the Joint Commission on Methodist Federation held in Chattanooga, Tenn., in 1911. The printer of it is not noted. The authority is not given. I have had no time to make such investigation as would make clear what was the principle of selection of the addresses in this publication or of this printing. It is not complete. It is not accurate. It ought not to have been published. These notes were not submitted to the speakers. I have never even seen what purports to come from me. When we enter into an agreement, brethren, touching the speeches and remarks that are made, we ought to abide by that agreement, and we ought to understand that we can depend upon the agreement. For my-

self, as one of the members of that Commission, for Bishop Wilson, who offered that resolution and can no longer speak for himself, for such of my colleagues as were present at that time, I seriously object to the printing of this without any notification whatever. It was a great blunder, and I hope it will never be repeated.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : There are two things to be said. There were two copies made by the Secretary. One is in the hands of Dr. Thomas, and one was in the hands of Dr. Evans. The latter undertook to send to the General Conference at Minneapolis his records as Secretary, including the report of the Chattanooga meeting and these addresses, but that package never came to my hands that I recall. I suspect that it went into the hands of a committee, perhaps the Committee on Federation, and may have been disposed of in the rubbish of the General Conference. At any rate, it was lost. Some of us wanted to see these records. I think I wrote the stenographer and asked him for his report. A copy was furnished me, but I lost track of it somewhere. Later Dr. Thomas kindly sent a copy to Dr. Storms, Dr. Evans's successor. It was natural that the members of the Commissions should want copies. It seems to me that the members of both Commissions on Federation at Chattanooga should be entitled to all information desired. That leaves the query as to a partial report. What we have is what was taken down and preserved by the stenographers who served. That is all I can say about that. I do not think there is in the report anything that I did not say. I might have said it a little better or a little worse than is there put down. I have been considerably disappointed in some stenographic attempts to reproduce my sentences, and I have about made up my mind that I will take either pen or pencil where I am to be printed. A man has a right to make himself say what he is trying to say. There is something in the way of interpretation by presence or voice that is lost when words go into print. Facility of utterance is not always attained by felicity of speech. One cannot tell, without having a chance to review the production, whether it is what one wanted to put before the world or not. I sympathize with Bishop Denny's feeling; yet, inasmuch as the matter has been kept within bounds and now access to it is had only by members of the Commission, who are entitled to know these things, I doubt whether any very great harm has been done. Bishop McConnell said to me once: "After I preached as well as I could and found myself reported in the New York *Herald* as having delivered an address on prize-fighting, I sent the report to the President, who had heard my sermon, and he said: 'If you are going to be a public man, you will have to take your medicine.'"

F. M. Thomas: It was the Secretary of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church Commission who asked for a copy because his had been lost. I sent it to him, but I told him that I considered it very inaccurate. I scarcely recognized what I myself had said. I think that the record is very inaccurate. After keeping it awhile, he returned it to me. I knew nothing about the publication.

Bishop Hoss: I do not think anything serious is going to come from this. But this is serious: the members of this Commission, after having passed a resolution of that sort, are entitled to have the resolution obeyed and to have their utterance kept secret until they have had a chance to look over it. I never said anything that I was not willing to modify if I could do it better or was afraid to have published. I do not scare at the sound of my own voice. But I did not authorize anybody to publish that for me, and I was protected in the freedom of my utterance in that Commission by the assurance that I should have a chance to look over the report of what I said before it was published.

Bishop Denny: I cannot let this matter go on the basis on which you put it. The matter is not only of historic importance; but I emphasized the statement made by Bishop Hoss, that it is a serious matter, when you have a formal agreement, to fail to carry out the agreement. We did have this formal agreement. It is the only time I ever knew Bishop Wilson to offer such a resolution as that. Yet after it was offered and passed and those of us who were present had, we supposed, the assurance that it was not a scrap of paper, no attention was paid to it. It is serious, it was a mistake, I protest against it, and I hope it will not be repeated.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You are now getting the matter shifted over to moral turpitude. That is a thing which you do not mean to do and which I, of course, should not allow to pass unchallenged. If the Secretary had read all the minutes, he would have found that action and have understood it. But it was all done without any consultation with any old member of the Committee and in entire innocence simply for the convenience of the members of the Commission.

A. W. Harris: Of course it was done on authority—on the authority of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is the complete stenographic report without editing or change, a reproduction of the report as it came into my hands. It would be easy, if the Joint Commission orders, to collect the copies; for every copy issued was issued by number to members of the Northern Commission, and twenty-five copies were issued to the Southern Commission. We can get them and burn them up if we wish.

Bishop Hamilton: It seems to me that there is no publica-

tion of this document in the sense in which we speak of a publication. The fact is that no one of you questions that it is the only record you have, no matter how incomplete. If any of you had gone to the Secretary to look it over, you would have seen the only record in existence.

Bishop Hoss: It was selections from the record.

F. M. Thomas: I think the record in this book is all the record we have of the speeches at that time.

Bishop Hamilton: It appears to me, then, that there is no difference between sending around a typewritten copy of the record and a printed one. These brethren, not having it, found it was cheaper to prepare a printed copy of it than to have a typewritten copy. The only mistake, it seems to me, in the whole matter was in sending any copy of this to the members of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or giving it to us or any one else than those entitled to the minutes. I had never seen a copy until I came here. I suppose the only publication of it that you can call such is the distribution within these Commissions or the Commission on Federation. That can scarcely be called publication. I am certainly as emphatic as these brethren can be in saying that what is to be done for the future with regard to anything that is said here ought to be the submission of what is said to every man who said it. Mr. Spurgeon was always in the habit of preaching two sermons when he preached only one—one to the people, the other through the press—and he would never let one stenographically taken go out from under his hands until he had reviewed it.

The time of the session was extended.

J. M. Moore: We are in a way the successors of the men who had the meeting in Chattanooga. We are greatly interested in the discussion that took place when these eight suggestions were brought in. I was glad to get this report. I am thankful to Dr. Harris for giving me a copy, and I think the members of our Commission here are thankful for the copies they have had. They are valuable to us. For one, while there are mistakes that have been made, we can yet through that report get something of the atmosphere of the Chattanooga meeting and something of the discussion that went on at that time. If mistakes were made, let us forget them and try not to make any again.

Bishop Mouzon: I am very sorry indeed that you did not keep a full stenographic report of everything that was said. I am also very sorry that such reports as were kept were not submitted to the speakers for their revision. Having said that, I now say that I am grateful to you for printing this even as it is. I am sure it will do me good. I thank you for my copy. I will read it very carefully. I do not consider that it has been pub-

lished. This is all private, and it has not been published. I felt that it was due you, my brethren, that I should say this.

F. M. Thomas: I think Bishop Mouzon has called attention to the fact that the real trouble was that the stenographer was not accurate. I am sure that if Dr. Harris had been Secretary and had received the letter I wrote to the Secretary he would have called attention to the matter. The trouble is corrected now. We have a stenographer now than whom there is no better in America. He can write a speech better than we ourselves can.

The session adjourned with the benediction pronounced by Bishop Cranston.

AFTERNOON SESSION, DECEMBER 29

The afternoon session opened at 2:50 in the chapel of the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Episcopal Church, Bishop Cranston in the chair.

The hymn "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," was sung.

The roll was called, and the following Commissioners answered present: Bishops E. E. Hoss, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, from the M. E. Church, South; Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, R. J. Cooke, from the M. E. Church. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, from the M. E. Church, South; Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, from the M. E. Church. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, from the M. E. Church, South; G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, I. E. Robinson, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., from the M. E. Church.

Prayer was offered by W. J. Young and by D. G. Downey.

Secretary F. M. Thomas read the minutes of the morning session, which, after slight corrections, were approved.

Bishop Denny: I wish, for the purpose of historic accuracy, to have it entered that I called attention to that publication as unauthorized, incomplete, and inaccurate.

Bishop Candler took the chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The action of the morning session was to invite reserves to sit with us. Perhaps we ought to enter their names at this time. I will ask the Chairmen to name the reserves who may be present.

Dr. J. R. Joy, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Dr.

W. Asbury Christian and Judge E. W. Hines, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were reported as present.

J. F. Goucher: Arrangements have been made for a watch night service Sunday night, to be held at the Trinity M. E. Church, South. The self-constituted committee making preliminary arrangements thought they had no authority to provide for the details of that service. I would move that the details of that service be referred to our Committee on Organization and Procedure, with power.

This motion prevailed.

F. M. Thomas: I would ask the privilege of the Commission. On Sunday evening in Louisville there will be held a joint watch night service of the two Methodisms, at which there will be a special memorial service for Bishop Wilson, in connection with prayers for this Commission. In view of the fact that this is to be a memorial service for Bishop Wilson, I request the privilege of transmitting to that committee a copy of the statement presented by Bishop Cranston this morning.

This privilege was granted.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Secretary will read the action of the Joint Commission on Federation at Chattanooga May 12, 1911.

The Secretary read this action:

I

We suggest as a plan of reorganization the merging of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, into one Church, to be known as the Methodist Episcopal Church in America or the Methodist Church in America.

II

We suggest that this Church shall have throughout common Articles of Faith, common conditions of membership, a common hymnal, a common catechism, and a common ritual.

III

We suggest that the governing power in the reorganized Church shall be vested in one General Conference and three or four Quadrennial Conferences, both General and Quadrennial Conferences to exercise their powers under constitutional provisions and restrictions, the General Conference to have full legislative power over all matters distinctly connectional and the Quadrennial Conference to have full power over distinctly local affairs.

We suggest that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and such other organizations of colored Methodists as may enter into agreement with them may be constituted and recognized as one of the Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences of the proposed reorganization.

IV

We suggest that the General Conference shall consist of two houses, each house to be composed of equal numbers of ministerial and lay dele-

42 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

gates. The delegates in the first house shall be apportioned equally among the Quadrennial Conferences and elected under equitable rules to be provided therefor. The ministerial delegates in the second house shall be elected by the ministerial members in the Annual Conferences and the lay delegates by the laity within the Annual Conferences under equitable rules to be provided therefor. Each Annual Conference shall have at least one ministerial and one lay delegate. The larger Conferences shall have one additional ministerial and one additional lay delegate for every — ministerial members of the Conference, also an additional ministerial and lay delegate where there is an excess of two-thirds of the fixed rate of representation. All legislation of the General Conference shall require the concurrent action of the two houses.

V

We suggest that the Quadrennial Conferences shall be composed of an equal number of ministerial and lay delegates, to be chosen by the Annual Conferences within their several jurisdictions, according to an equitable plan to be provided for.

VI

We suggest that the Quadrennial Conferences shall fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences within their respective jurisdictions and that the Annual Conferences shall be composed of all traveling preachers in full connection therewith and of one lay representative from each pastoral charge.

VII

We suggest that the Quadrennial Conferences shall name the bishops from their several jurisdictions, the same to be confirmed by the first house of the General Conference.

VIII

We suggest that neither the General Conference nor any of the Quadrennial Conferences be invested with final authority to interpret the constitutionality of its own actions.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The next order is the presentation of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Oklahoma City May 14, 1914.

Secretary Thomas read this action, as follows :

1. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, considers the plan outlined in the suggestions that were adopted by the Joint Commission representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and reported to the General Conferences of their respective Churches as tentative, but nevertheless containing the basic principles of a genuine unification of the Methodist bodies in the United States, and especially of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the method of reorganization.

2. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation as feasible and desirable and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization and in favor of the unification of all or any Methodist bodies who accept this proposed plan after it has been accepted by

the Methodist Episcopal Church. However, we recommend that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization holding fraternal relations with the reorganized and united Church.]

3. The representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the Federal Council of Methodism are hereby instructed and empowered to act as Commissioners with like Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church or with Commissioners of the Methodist Protestant Church and other Methodist bodies in the United States in elaborating and perfecting the tentative plan that has been proposed and in carrying forward such negotiations as have for their purpose, and may result in, the consummation of the proposed unification in accordance with the basic principles enunciated in the suggestions which were adopted by the Joint Commission and reported to the General Conferences. Should the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1916 declare itself in favor of unification through the proposed plan of organization and appoint a Commission on Unification, separate from the Federal Council of Methodism, the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are hereby instructed and empowered to appoint a similar Commission that shall serve until the meeting of the next General Conference. The representatives of this Church in the Federal Council of Methodism, or such Commission on Unification as may be appointed, shall report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Federal Council of Methodism, or the Joint Commission on Unification, for its consideration and final determination. The representatives of this Church are hereby instructed to say to the Joint Commission on Unification that the name preferred for the reorganized and united Church is the Methodist Church in America.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Let us hear the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church taken at Saratoga Springs May 16, 1916.

Secretary Harris read the same, as follows:

The Methodist Episcopal Church, in General Conference assembled, hails with joy the prospect of an early reunion with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

We believe that the united Church will have greatly increased power in its conflict with evil in all lands, that it will be able to lay more effective emphasis on the fundamentals of Christianity, and that it will be more potent in developing the higher loyalty to the supremacy of our common Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

We believe that such a union will hasten the development of a truly world Church, which will make for the rapid advancement and final triumph of the kingdom of God in the world.

Your Committee on Unification therefore recommends that the General Conference make the following declarations:

1. The Methodist Episcopal Church considers the plan outlined in the suggestions that were adopted by the Joint Commission representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with one modifying recommendation, as tentative but nevertheless as containing the basic principles of a genuine unification of the Methodist bodies in the United States, and especially of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the method of reorganization.

44 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

2. The Methodist Episcopal Church regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization, with the following recommendations:

(a) That the General Conference be made the supreme legislative, executive, and judicial body of the Church under constitutional provisions and restrictions.

(b) That the number of Quadrennial Conferences as stated in the proposed plan be so increased as to provide more adequately for the needs of the reorganized Church both at home and abroad.

(c) That the General Conference consist of a single house, made up of delegates elected by the Quadrennial or Annual Conferences or both.

We also favor the unification of all or any Methodist bodies who accept this proposed plan after it has been accepted and perfected by both the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

(d) That, conforming to the suggestion of the Joint Commission, the colored membership of the reorganized Church be constituted into one or more Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences.

3. The Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church is hereby authorized and instructed to appoint a Commission of twenty-five members (five bishops, ten ministers, and ten laymen), to confer with Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and other Methodist bodies in the United States in elaborating and perfecting the tentative plan that has been proposed and in carrying forward such negotiations as have for their purpose, and shall result in, the consummation of the proposed unification in accordance with the basic principles enunciated in the suggestions which were adopted by the Joint Commission and approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

So sincerely do we believe that the union of the two Episcopal Methodisms is the will of God, and so earnestly and devoutly do we desire that these two Churches may be one, that we hereby authorize and instruct the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to conduct the negotiations in a generous and brotherly spirit.

This Commission shall report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Joint Commission on Unification for its consideration and final determination.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The next order of business is a statement from each Commission of the powers and duties imposed upon it by the action of its own General Conference. Each statement, I assume, will be made by the Chairman of the Commission. The Joint Commission will hear the statement from Bishop Cranston.

Bishop McDowell made the statement for the Methodist Episcopal Church Commission, as follows: Mr. Chairman, the powers and duties of the Commission are fairly stated in the documents which Secretary Harris has just read, but in amplification and possible clarification of them I am authorized to state: The Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church is authorized and directed to negotiate with the Commission from the Methodist

Episcopal Church, South: First, on the basis of the document adopted by the Joint Commission on Federation at Chattanooga and presented to both General Conferences; second, on the basis of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, taken at Oklahoma; third, on the basis of action taken by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga. It is considered that these three documents at least are all before us with a degree of official standing that does not attach to any other documents now formally before us. But the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church also regards itself as authorized and empowered to consider these various actions as recommended, but not as stating final instructions from which we are not authorized to make any departures. We are further authorized, as you will see from the document that has just been read, after reaching an agreement with the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to enter negotiations, and this presumably with your consent, with other Methodisms, particularly with the Methodist Protestant Church, which was a party to the first document. The spirit in which we are instructed and authorized to conduct these negotiations is expressed in the specific resolution which was read at the conclusion of the action of our General Conference—namely, that we regard the consummation of unification as so desirable in every way that we are instructed to conduct these negotiations in a generous and brotherly spirit. Further, and finally, the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church is expected and required to report the results of what consideration may be had to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for action. Our powers, therefore, as you see, are not final in this matter. I think that fairly states what is involved in the interpretation of the powers and responsibilities of our Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You have heard read, brethren, the action taken by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, assembled in Oklahoma City May 14, 1914. It scarcely needs interpretation at my hands, and I am not sure I can make it more clear. I may say that the Conference did not feel that it could pass by the action, reported both by the bishops and by the Federal Council, of the Joint Commissioners on the work done at Chattanooga in 1911. That action was very fully considered, and out of it and based upon it is the action which has been read in your hearing to-day. Like the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it contemplated in explicit terms as the final outcome, if we shall succeed in framing a plan of unification, the bringing into the negotiations of our brethren of the Methodist Protestant Church. Under the action of the General Conference held at

46 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

Oklahoma City May, 1914, our Commission has been appointed. We are not bound in every minute detail, as you will see from the paper read. The Commission does feel bound, however, by certain essential and specific basal principles from which we do not feel free to depart. I may mention, not in all detail, but certain more general principles. The first of these principles is that we consider ourselves bound, with reference to the powers of the General Conference and Quadrennial Conferences, that no one of these Conferences shall be authorized to pass upon and determine the constitutionality of its own acts. In the second place, we feel bound, as to the Jurisdictional Conferences, that they shall have their autonomy, legislating upon matters involved in their own jurisdictions. And in the third place, that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of such colored Churches as may elect to enter into the reorganization of American Methodism, are to be dealt with in such manner as shall make full recognition of race consciousness and at the same time offer them the most fraternal coöperation and brotherly assistance. As is the case with your Commission, we also have not final authority to adopt a plan of unification. We are bound to report back our action with reference to proceedings had here at this meeting, or at any subsequent meetings that may follow, for the final consideration of the General Conference.

Bishop Cranston : I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, whether your exposition of the action of your General Conference suggests a broad program recommended by the Committee or otherwise. Is it under your instructions from the Committee?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I was speaking with reference to the expressed principles of our Commission on these basic principles.

Bishop McDowell : The Committee on Organization and Procedure called for a statement at this point from each Commission of its power and responsibilities.

Bishop Cranston : I think this is perhaps as good a place as will occur naturally for the presentation of what I believe to be the views held by our Commission. I want to say that the Commission, as such, has not taken any action which purports to give its own understanding in every detail of the matter. Bishop Candler has been kind enough, and I am very glad he did, to make a statement as to the understanding of your General Conference and your Commission concerning the significance of these "recommendations." Brethren, I do not know whether you will forgive me or not if I read the paper in my hands, written with the hope that it would bring, as promptly as might be expedient, an understanding of the issues between us.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I think the next item that the Committee has adopted in the order here will bring that mat-

ter before us. Perhaps it would be more orderly if we came to it then. We have heard statements made by Bishop McDowell, authorized by his Commission to speak, and the statement I have made of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The next order put down here by your action this morning is that we consider the action of each General Conference seriatim. We are under that head. Bishop Cranston desires to present a paper bearing on that.

Bishop Cranston: My paper is a little more comprehensive than that. It occurred to me that it might be well to present in a formal way a document which might be considered as a preliminary agreement developing in itself, and as the discussion concerning it might proceed, the issues between the two Churches as set forth in these several actions. I think I can read it in about ten minutes, and then I will give you each a copy. This is a proposed preliminary agreement.

Bishop Cranston read this paper, as follows:

PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT

December —, 1916.

Called of God through our respective General Conferences to the holy task of perfecting a plan, the basic principles of which have been already agreed upon between them, for the unification of these two branches of American Methodism, and after importunate prayer for the blessing of God and the constant guidance of the Holy Spirit in discharge of this sacred duty, we deem it of the utmost immediate importance that we have at the outset a clear understanding of the nature and end of our deliberation in this behalf.

Such an understanding can be reached only through a mutually accepted interpretation of the spirit and intent of the two General Conferences concerned in creating this Joint Commission.

Seeking such an interpretation, we agree:

1. That preliminary and preparatory to the action creating this Joint Commission both these General Conferences and the people represented by them having been led by the Spirit to seek closer fellowship and co-operation in the work of God, each of these great representative bodies believed its action in authorizing such a Commission for the purpose in view to be in obedience to the will of God and in harmony with the mind that was in Jesus Christ, his Son; therefore we, as their agents and commissioners in the fulfillment of a trust so sacred, are bound by the conditions of our appointment, as well as by our own individual allegiance to the highest interests of the kingdom of God, to deliberate, speak, and act in accord with the promptings of God's Spirit and the teachings of our one Lord, who is the Head over all his Church. And may the blessed Trinity vouchsafe to us the spirit of patience, love, and wisdom as we proceed in our holy task!

2. We agree that the divinely appointed mission of our common Methodism is the more rapid extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ through the preaching and living of his glorious gospel, the supreme, all-conquering note of which is love to God and to our fellow men. It is also our mutual understanding that our General Conferences and people desire that the unification of Methodism, at home and throughout the world, by the method of reorganization, shall proceed upon this conception of

48 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

its mission, now recognized more vividly than ever before. This means that this Joint Commission must face unflinchingly the immediate and appalling spiritual needs of the war-distracted world—needs that are increasingly emphasized, but by no means compassed, in their direful urgency by the appeals that come to us from our missionary battle lines pleading for reënforcement at every front. Through this movement for unification by reorganization, the outcome of which is providentially so largely intrusted to this Joint Commission, God is calling us and all our people to make full return of our stewardship through the complete consecration of every resource, without waste by contentious administration; to concentrate every atom of our spiritual energy where it will tell for the healing of human woes and victory over the powers of evil; to the subordinating of every individual interest and preference and of all our denominational pride and insistence under the stress of this crucial epoch in our holy warfare. If our Methodism be deaf to this call of God, who made us a people, who were no people, we may well fear that our tongue of fire will grow cold and lifeless with the numbness that follows disobedience.

3. That we may be the more free in the prosecution of our task, we agree here and now that all the issues and differences of the past which have been already the subjects of consideration and action by the two General Conferences and all agreements and covenants which have been entered into concerning the same are beyond the domain of review by this Joint Commission. Inspired, however, by the manifest desire of our General Conferences, as thus expressed, for closer fellowship and more Christlike service, and with gratitude to God for having led our respective Churches thus far in their approaches to each other, we would in the spirit of these agreements and covenants, however imperfectly realized in practice, patiently and prayerfully apply ourselves to the constructive task assigned to us—namely, the devising of a plan of unification by reorganization in accordance with the basic principles already agreed upon and referred to us for our guidance. Among these covenants we specifically recognize the Cape May agreement and the Baltimore statement of 1910, concerning the identical status of the two Churches as related to original Episcopal Methodism, both of which declarations were approved by our respective General Conferences. And that these two documents may be before us, we herewith quote them.

[CAPE MAY, 1876]

"Each of said Churches is a legitimate branch of Episcopal Methodism in the United States, having a common origin in the Methodist Episcopal Church, organized in 1784.

"Since the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was consummated, in 1845, by the voluntary exercise of the right of the Southern Annual Conferences, ministers and members, to adhere to that communion, it has been an evangelical Church, reared on Scriptural foundations, and her ministers and members, with those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have constituted one Methodist family, though in distinct ecclesiastical connections."

[BALTIMORE, 1910]

"We are mutually agreed that the Churches represented by us are equally apostolic in faith and purpose and have a common origin, the Methodist Episcopal Church, organized in 1784; that they are joint heirs of the traditions and doctrinal standards of the fathers; and that they have proved their loyalty to the evangelical faith and evangelical spirit which characterized early Methodists.

"We are mutually agreed that our fathers settled the issues of the past

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 49

conscientiously for themselves, respectively, and separated regretfully, believing that only such action could insure their continued access to the people they were called to serve."

4. We agree that the eight "suggestions" approved by the Joint Commission on Federation at Chattanooga in May, 1911, as a tentative plan and basis for further negotiations, and subsequently indorsed unanimously by both General Conferences as "containing the basic principles of a genuine unification of the Methodist bodies in America," shall be accepted as a starting point and guide in our present negotiations.

5. We agree, further, that the phrase "basic principles," as used by the two General Conferences, refers primarily to constitutional provision for the protection of minority bodies entering into the reorganization and includes (a) equitable representation in the General Conference and (b) the guarantee of such degree and form of autonomous government and administration as will contribute to the evangelistic efficiency and spiritual progress of every population or class included in the reorganized Church. We understand both General Conferences to be unreservedly committed to these constitutional provisions.

6. As to the several "recommendations" adopted by our respective General Conferences, in connection with their unanimous sanction of these "basic principles," we agree that, while these recommendations express in each instance a strong preference at variance with one or another of the suggestions as reported by the Joint Commission on Federation, nevertheless the form of expression does not indicate that any of these recommendations was intended as a final prejudgment of the point thus noted. [Had such been the intention, or had it been even considered that these recommendations might invalidate or weaken the approval of the "basic principles" so strongly indorsed, there could have been little hope and certainly no enthusiasm in the appointment of such a Commission as this on the part of the General Conference making four out of five of these recommendations; nor would it have been in keeping with any such intention to have declared "unification by this general plan proposed feasible and desirable" and to specifically instruct its Commissioners "to conduct the negotiations in a generous and brotherly spirit." The same line of interpretation attaches with equal pertinency to the one modifying recommendation inserted by the Southern General Conference after its indorsement of the tentative suggestions and its declaration of the desirability of unification on the basic principles contained therein.] We therefore agree that these several recommendations are to be classed with other negotiable questions and problems in the domain of mutual concession and are to be considered in their proper relations as the plan of unification by reorganization progresses.

7. We further agree that all committees that may be appointed to consider and report upon subjects and details committed to them shall regard the foregoing agreements as in the nature of instructions with reference to the points covered therein and formulate their reports in accordance therewith.

8. It is agreed that at least one-half hour of every regular session of the Joint Commission shall be devoted to thanksgiving and prayer.

Upon this testimony of our common faith and mutual desire that the will of God may be accomplished in us and by us, the Joint Commission invokes his blessing of approval.

Let all our people say "Amen! Let brotherly love prevail."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Will you consider this paper now or follow the action taken this morning that we

consider the action of the Joint Federation at Chattanooga and by our General Conferences?

J. F. Goucher: I move that this paper of Bishop Cranston's be received and made the order of the day for to-morrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Bishop Hoss: I suggest that, before we make an order of the day to consider this paper, we hear from the other Church and consider whatever they may both have to say jointly. Certainly it would not be wise to proceed to a consideration to-morrow of a paper from either side separately. In Methodist Conferences a paper is received when it is read. I do not think we can begin the disposal of it until we have heard from the other side.

Bishop McDowell: Do you withdraw your motion?

J. F. Goucher: With great pleasure, in view of Bishop Hoss's statement.

Bishop McDowell: Then I think we ought to refrain from making an order of the day for the consideration of this document or any similar one from the Church, South, until that is presented. Then we can make an order of the day for the consideration of both.

Bishop Mouzon: Let me ask for information. I am not quite clear in my mind. Is this a paper which Bishop Cranston personally presents the Commission, or has this paper been read and approved by the Commissioners representing the Methodist Episcopal Church? And does this paper come to us giving expression of the mind of the members of the Commission representing the Methodist Episcopal Church?

Bishop Cranston: I stated distinctly in the course of my remarks that the contents of this paper are known to members of our Commission. But I did not ask the Commission to take any vote upon it at all. These are my own understandings concerning the plan and our feelings under it. I feel perfectly free in presenting the matter here and leaving the fate of the whole paper to yourselves.

Bishop Mouzon: Just to clarify my own thinking, brethren. It occurs to me that this Commission can hardly take this paper under advisement and discussion. It seems to me it should first go before the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is hardly competent for us to discuss this paper. The Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, hardly feel free to discuss your paper. It seems to me that, while we are happy to have this paper and read it personally, we can hardly discuss it here as a Commission. If the members of your Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church will discuss this paper and come to conclusions and then present the paper, we would be free to discuss it.

Bishop Hamilton: I want to say for myself, and I think I

am not wrongly interpreting the minds of others, and I am sure I am not misrepresenting any expression of our Commission, when I say that we come here with our hands wholly untied. We have taken no action upon any issue coming before this body. We desired as individuals and as a Commission to consider the matters here that were to come before this body. If these several matters are to be referred to committees, and committees bring in reports that involve some of these issues, then I would feel free to take them up in our Commission and discuss them there and, if necessary, take action. But I took the ground in our Commission that we wanted to take no action whatever upon any issue, I was inclined to say even preliminary questions, that would involve any matter coming before the Joint Commission. Therefore Bishop Cranston presents this paper as having come to him alone by the inspiration of his own mind. It was read to me in Washington before I came here. I want the whole Joint Commission to understand, as far as I am concerned, that we are here ready to go into any kind of free, brotherly discussion of questions starting here anew.

Bishop Cranston : In regard to what Bishop Mouzon has said, I am not sure but any brother of this Commission has the right to move the adoption of any paper touching the matter we have before us. I would feel perfectly free to make such a motion. I see no reason why any man cannot bring any proposition he pleases here and you refer it to any sifting committee you may constitute. I want to get these thoughts into your minds. Whatever my convictions may be in regard to their source will not interest you. But I am so certain that they have a relation to the final outcome of all this affair and that their prayerful consideration will contribute to early solution of our problems that I am inclined to put the paper before you.

H. M. Du Bose : I move to receive it and that it be left in the hands of the Secretaries until such time as we please to call it up.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I think the paper has been received. It is before you. I suppose that your motion is that it lie on the table for future consideration.

H. M. Du Bose : That is it.

Bishop Cranston : Is that a motion to lay that paper on the table?

Bishop McDowell : The purpose of that motion was to postpone consideration.

H. M. Du Bose : That is the purpose of my motion. Was my motion put, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The motion to table is not debatable. It always carries with it the idea that you may take it up.

Bishop Hoss : While it is unquestionably true that each broth-

er of this Commission will finally vote his individual judgment and not be controlled by the judgment of his fellows, we have already decided that this matter must be settled, not by individuals, but by the Commission. There must be a majority of each Commission voting in favor of anything we do before it is settled. And I think we are going to reach our conclusions better if as Commissioners we join hands. I want to know what my brethren from the Methodist Episcopal Church as a Commission think about these matters. I have very great respect for the personal opinions of Bishop Cranston. There is not any man in American Methodism for whose personal opinions I have greater respect. But I am not willing to enter upon a consideration of these very grave issues that are before us and that must at last be settled by us as Commissioners and not as individuals until I know what the mind of the separate Commission is, at least in a general way. I am perfectly willing that the same rule shall be applied to the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I trust it will be applied. I do not think we have anything to gain by holding back at that point. I do not mean to say there is any disposition to hold back. If I speak awkwardly, please pardon me. Whatever the issue or outcome of our deliberations here, it is not absolutely imperative that it be one thing or another. But it is absolutely imperative that it be full of courtesy and frankness and brotherly love. I am willing to say for myself and for my Church what we consider to be a proper way of adjusting these matters. And I hope you will do the same thing. Please do not hold back anything for fear of hurting the feelings of any Southern Commissioners here. It is not a matter of much importance whether our feelings are hurt or not, but it is a matter of importance that we know definitely what you are prepared to do. I should be most happy if as a separate Commission you would take this paper up and give us at least some consideration. We are here facing your Commission. We are not here facing an individual, but a Commission. I am not here as an individual, but as a representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and as a member of this Commission. I feel it is my solemn duty, first of all, if I can, to come to agreement with the members of my own Commission. I wish to do that. Sometimes they are right, and sometimes they are wrong. The remark of Emerson is always pertinent: "Difference from me is the measure of absurdity." If I were going to discuss this paper before me now, I would not know exactly what I am discussing. We have not come to the points of difference yet. They are shadowy and vague and indefinite. I do not know what you are going to require of me before you take me in. I wish to know, not merely the mind of an individual bishop, but the mind of this Commission. If I

am to come into the Methodist Episcopal Church, I want to know what the conditions are under which I am expected to come in. If I am to coöperate, I want to know the conditions under which I am to be permitted to coöperate. We have got to come to that at last. We have got the thing to settle definitely and squarely. And the sooner we face the real difficulties, the better it will be for us. There are some difficulties. These beautiful sentences that we have had from Bishop Cranston go straight to my heart. They "warm the cockles of my heart." I enjoy them as much as any man possibly could. But I know that before I get through with this business I have got to look you squarely in the face and find out the terms that you are going to impose on us. And I do not think they are set forth definitely in this paper. I would like very much to know what the mind of your Commission as a *Commission* is, and I do not ask anything that I am not willing to give you myself. Bishop McDowell is not so old as Bishop Cranston, but I want to know what his mind is. I want to know the mind of these laymen. I have great respect for the lay mind. It has a very important bearing on all these issues involved. I want, if it is possible, a definite statement of what you can do. There are difficulties before us. God help us all! I am not going to get angry with anybody if he does not agree with me.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair is in a state of uncertainty as to what you propose. You have said here to me that the next order is consideration of the action of each General Conference *seriatim*. Out of my great deference to Bishop Cranston I waited to hear his paper, to see if it was under that head. If you wish to suspend that order and consider this paper now, it is entirely agreeable to me; but I wish to obey your orders.

Bishop McDowell: I think what is technically before us in the form of Dr. Du Bose's motion, to put the paper in the hands of the Secretary, to be brought up as a later order, is equivalent to a motion to postpone consideration. I think I agree in the main with Bishop Mouzon and Bishop Hoss in what they have in mind with reference to the importance of knowing the mind of the Commission of each Church upon every one of the great matters before us. But Bishop Cranston is alone responsible for this particular paper. And as a distinct matter of courtesy it was thought fair by us not to adopt it before his presenting it. But this will answer both Bishop Hoss's desire and Bishop Mouzon's, I am sure: When the paper does come before the Commission as a whole for action, the mind of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church upon the points involved in this paper will be made known. We are now free to consider it without any possible courtesy in our separate meetings, it

having been presented to you. Before you are asked to act upon it except in the simple way of postponing consideration, I am very sure that we shall discuss it fully and present our united verdict upon it.

J. F. Goucher: I differ a little from the statement made by Bishop Hoss, if I understood him. Bishop Cranston very graciously read his paper to me. He is always courteous. He said: "Would it be well to take it to our Commission as a matter of courtesy?" I said to him: "Bishop Cranston, personally I would say no; for personally I consider myself primarily to be a member of the Commission of Fifty, and secondarily a member of our Commission of twenty-five. The purpose, spirit, and desire of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was to secure unification through reorganization. I would not desire personally, and would feel uncomfortable if it should be asked, for our Commission of twenty-five men to put up some sort of a statement until we had heard the views of the other half of the Commission of which we are members. We are appointed as members of a Joint Commission rather than as members of an individual Commission. If this matter came before the Commission of fifty, of which I consider myself primarily a member, and it should refer it to the twenty-five of the Methodist Episcopal Church after we had had the opportunity of hearing their views and their discussion, holding my judgment in abeyance until I had received the enlightenment coming to me from them, I would then be willing to express an opinion. But I was not willing to be a party to expressing an opinion that was simply formulated in the atmosphere of twenty-five, because we come here with no instructions except to do our best to secure the result desired. I say, therefore, again that I cannot understand this statement about being "taken in."

Bishop Hoss: Don't take me too seriously, please.

J. F. Goucher: If there had been any "taking in" process intended, we would not have sent twenty-five men to meet your twenty-five men, because your felicitous method of securing anything you desire would put us at great disadvantage.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The duty and safety of the Chair is in following the rules. A moment ago I put a motion which seemed to me the most courteous motion you could make —namely, to table—the Chair being under instructions to follow the usual parliamentary law. If you adopt postponement, it must be definite or indefinite, under those rules. If definite, you must fix an hour. If indefinite, you can never take it up again. In the latter case, it would be out of the house forever. I was not willing for the last. I wish to know whether you mean to table, to postpone indefinitely, or to postpone to a definite time.

Bishop Cranston: I wonder if the distinction made by the

brethren who have spoken is clear to all of us. My understanding is that it is the attitude of Bishop Hoss that matters of this gravity should not be taken up by this body unless they have first been considered by one of the Commissions separately and a determination reached in regard to it; while on the other hand Dr. Goucher and Bishop McDowell have endeavored to make it clear that the failure of our Commission to take this matter up was not due to unwillingness to express judgment, but to a sense of delicacy in view of the situation and to a courteous consideration of the Joint Commission itself. Some of us apparently feel that we ought to act as separate Commissions first in any matter presented; others have the thought that we are here as one body of fifty rather than two bodies of twenty-five. It is no marvel that at this stage of the proceedings we have that difference of opinion. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to be an obstacle. If you lay that paper on the table in a cold, formal way, you must consider whether you are doing any damage to the cause we are here to serve. I do not believe it is the purpose of my brethren to allow that paper to go to the table under that kind of a motion. I cannot conceive of their permitting such a thing. Perhaps my duty is just now, by your consent, to take that paper out of your hands and let our Commission determine what they shall do with reference to that or any matter which they shall bring before you. However, I want the privilege of sending that paper, when it comes back to me, wherever I shall choose to send it. That is to say, if I present a paper here of such dignity and character as that paper and it shall be refused consideration in some way in open session or by committee, that paper is my paper, and I can carry it to any tribunal on earth. I believe that the people of our Churches want union, that they desire to come together. But while I wish to submit to all order and to be governed as long as I am a member of this body by every rule you adopt, I cannot consent that my deepest convictions shall be outraged by a harsh parliamentary procedure.

T. D. Samford: My personal view of this matter is that, technically speaking, possibly the proposal of this paper at this time may have been a little out of order. Still I do not understand by the rules which we have adopted that they look at all to restricting motions or propositions to the action of either Commission. I should feel free to make any motion or proposition to this Commission that I might be inspired to make. The determination of that proposition or motion, under our rules, I understand to be left to each Commission. I conceive and consider that this is a very valuable contribution at this early stage of our proceedings to this Commission and to individual members of it. So far as I am personally concerned, I feel under

deep obligations to Bishop Cranston for taking the trouble to prepare this paper and submit it to us. I would have appreciated it if he had submitted it to me. I appreciate it none the less that he has submitted it at the earliest moment he could and suggested that we take it under prayerful consideration. And I shall hope to take it up for such consideration as the rules of this Commission will permit when the minds of this Commission are ready.

E. C. Reeves: I want to vote intelligently on this matter. We have a proposition coming before us to refer to a special day and hour the matters contained therein for consideration. It is a request from a single individual and one whom I respect, whom I love, from what Bishop Hoss has told me of him (Bishop Cranston), and one who ranks me by some six months in age. I should bow to him. He ranks me because he is a bishop and I am not. Still, here we meet upon the level and are going to part upon the square. But I want to understand fully what I am doing. I believe it was Bishop McDowell who stated that this comes as a proposition from a single individual, not from the Commission. How have the two Churches approached each other? They are not single individuals. Did we not first have the Joint Federal Commission and then a move made by the General Conferences drawing closer and closer together by bodies and not as individuals? Why vary the rule now when we are trying to get into the Appian Way to travel together to Rome? Why should we have one individual come and say just how we shall get into that way? With all due respect to our good Bishop, if I have the same privilege that he has—and every brother has a like privilege—to put a paper before this body and have it referred as a special order, that would keep us here until dog days. We come here, not as individuals to represent ourselves as such, but to represent two Churches. We have a Commission on our side to meet a Commission on your side. We do not meet each other as individuals; we meet each other as representatives of our respective Churches. Our Church, on my side, holds certain things in polity, and your Church, on your side, does the same. Is it fair for a single individual from your side to come here and ask our entire Commission to consider what one member proposes? And if we do not agree with it, you have twenty-four more members to present twenty-four more papers to be considered. Why not move by bodies? Why not you get together and find out what your mind is about this paper, and we will get together and tell you what our mind is about it. If you want to know what our mind is about anything, we will tell you as a Commission what it is and not as individuals. Ought we not to continue to act that way? Can we settle anything in any other way? I think not. I think any other plan is impracticable.

I hope that this motion to refer this paper from an individual to this body and make a special sitting for it will not be consented to. I do not think we can make progress under it.

D. G. Downey: May I ask as to the parliamentary situation? I understand that practically this paper is upon the table.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I have tried to make it plain that I am not uncertain as to the rules, but as to whether you wish to observe them. The state of the case was that it was read. Nobody objected to that, though it interfered with your order. A motion was made to postpone its consideration to a definite hour, making it a special order for to-morrow at ten-thirty. That was withdrawn, and Dr. Du Bose moved that it be received and placed in the hands of the Secretary for after consideration. That seemed to be a motion to indefinitely postpone, which the Chair did not think you meant. In order to take another view of it he put it in another way. The Chairman will do whatever you wish.

D. G. Downey: Do you rule that the matter is before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Du Bose will have to explain what he desires.

H. M. Du Bose: I put it as a matter of unusual courtesy. My meaning was that it be received and left in the hands of the Secretaries until such time as we shall call it up.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Then you do not wish it to be taken as a motion to table or indefinitely postpone?

D. G. Downey: I think one difficulty arises, possibly, in the different interpretations of the two organizations with respect to the motion to lay on the table. In our Church the motion to lay on the table is a rather discourteous motion. It cuts off debate. It kills whatever is laid on the table.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair was going by your instructions—ordinary parliamentary law. In that law no such significance attaches to it.

D. G. Downey: With us, when a motion is laid on the table it is practically dead. It is a method of defeating a motion without any debate. I am sure this body does not wish so to treat this important paper. I doubt also if the motion you want to make is to refer it back to our Commission. There is something to be said, of course, in favor of the position of Bishop Mouzon and Bishop Hoss. There is also a great deal to be said in favor of the position of Dr. Goucher. I think we are in danger of doing ourselves injustice if in a very important question we fix our own minds before we have found the mind of the Commission. Do you not see that we almost force ourselves to stand by the position we have taken? Whereas if prior to our making a definite decision we had the mind of another body we should have the light not only of twenty-five men who are disposed

largely to think together, but the radiance from the other twenty-five. Then it might be referred back, and we could act more wisely. It seems to me that in the matter now before us we could get out of the difficulty by referring this important and highly valuable paper to our Committee on Organization and Procedure, they to consider it and bring it to us with suggestions as to how we may finally deal with it. That, I judge, will be a perfectly appropriate and courteous resolution, and it can come back after that consideration for determination as to what final disposition we shall make of it. I think I will take the risk of moving as a substitute for all before us that this paper be referred to the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

H. M. Du Bose: I desired only to put this matter in some courteous form. I withdraw the motion.

There being no objection, it was withdrawn.

F. M. Thomas: I desire to second Dr. Downey's motion and to say this word, that we owe to two men more than any other the fact that we have come as far as we are. I speak out of an experience of some years on this Commission. I have no hesitation in naming those men. They are Bishops Cranston and Hoss. I will also say in answer to my good friend, Judge Reeves, that if we had carried out *in extenso* in the subcommittees, and especially the Committee of Nine, the rule he has laid down we would have made no progress. I sat for three days and listened to Bishops Cranston and Hoss talking. They made speeches that would have done credit to the highest deliberative body in the world. At the close, when it came to voting, we usually voted the minds of our Churches. I think we will have to do that here. But I want to express, in seconding this motion, not only my personal affection, but my reverence for Bishop Cranston. And I most heartily second the motion of Dr. Downey.

R. E. Blackwell: I thought that in voting for the motion of Dr. Du Bose I would be doing what Bishop Cranston desired. I suspect that what he wanted was to present it for our prayerful consideration and therefore not for taking any action on it.

Bishop Cranston: Dr. Blackwell was right in so far as his intimation is applicable. I see, what I did not see a little while ago when I was speaking a little emphatically, the difference is one of understanding between you and us as to the intent of the motion to lay on the table. That is what I had in mind when I spoke of withdrawing the paper. It was under the sting of what seemed discourteous treatment, which Dr. Du Bose did not intend at all, that I spoke.

A. F. Watkins: I wish to say that personally I thank Bishop Cranston for the presentation of that paper. It is creditable to his head and to his heart. It does not make any difference to me whether the paper has come as the thought of one man or

the thought of a Commission, so far as the entertainment of it is concerned. I am not content that this paper should be laid on the table; for, whatever may have been the thought as expressed by our brethren as to our usage in the South, it is certainly true that practically the laying of a paper on the table means the disposition of it without debate. I would have been ready to vote for the motion of Dr. Du Bose, and am now ready to vote for the motion of Dr. Downey. I desire to do anything that would show our appreciation of that admirable paper.

Bishop Hoss: I did not think anybody could dream it possible that I would be capable of dealing with anything coming from Bishop Cranston in a discourteous or unbrotherly manner. I have been in the habit of presiding over deliberative bodies for many years. I did not know that anywhere in the world a paper laid on the table was not simply laid there to be taken up when anybody desires. That is according to Jefferson's "Manual," Reed's "Manual," McTyeire's "Manual," and others. I did not dream anything else but that we should put this paper on the table until we were in a position to consider it along with whatever other similar documents might be brought up. I wish, if I made any such impression by my awkwardness of utterance, to beg pardon of everybody. I do not think that it would be possible or proper for us at this present time to assign that paper and make it a special order for to-morrow at ten o'clock, because there are other documents to come in with it. I doubt, Mr. President, whether you ever gain anything in a deliberative assembly by departing from strict parliamentary usage. That is what parliamentary law is for—to prevent confusion and delay and the tangling up of matters. I want to give profoundest consideration to everything that Bishop Cranston has to say. But I was anxious to do it after I knew what backing he was likely to have from his fellow Commissioners. We are in danger of having another paper as good as that. I certainly hope I am not misunderstood.

C. W. Fairbanks: I never arise in an assembly like this that I do not feel like apologizing. I have followed with interest the observations that have been made here. We have consumed perhaps three-fourths of an hour when there has been no difference of purpose between any two. There is no purpose upon the part of any one to be discourteous to Bishop Cranston. Language was used which challenged the attention of the Chair. But it was not used in the sense in which some of the brethren took it. I want to say this much to Brother Cranston, and that is that I have not inferred from the remarks of any of our brethren that there is the slightest antagonism to his generous purpose. The Chair very properly said, when the motion was made to lay upon the table, that it perhaps required a little further consider-

ation by the Commission. I think that it is recognized generally that bills in legislative bodies or in assemblies like this are under the control of the body and that they may be accepted and disposed of upon specific instructions. As I infer from the motion our friend over here made, the splendid paper of Bishop Cranston was not killed, although under the strict interpretation of parliamentary law a motion to lay a matter upon the table is one way of killing it. Our friend coupled with his observation the request that the paper lie upon the table practically subject to call, subject to the further disposition of the Commission. I was going to suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that we have not come here simply to illuminate our knowledge upon parliamentary usage. Parliamentary law has caused much delay in legislative assemblies. What we are trying to follow here is not technicalities. We are trying to adhere to the substance. It occurred to me that it would be well, if the Committee has not made provision for it, to have a rule that the Commission by unanimous consent may modify any established rule. That will greatly aid in the expedition of our proceedings. It makes no pitfalls into which the unwary may fall, because it requires unanimous consent. I suggest to the Committee on Order of Business that they should consider whether it will not be in the interest of our work to report an amendment to the rules or an independent rule permitting any one to ask unanimous consent, under which the body may modify its rules at any time in the interest of the dispatch of business. I do not care to prolong this. I rose primarily to suggest that we are wasting time over a matter about which there is no difference of purpose. I am entirely in accord with the parliamentary ruling of the Chair, but want to suggest a rule for unanimous consent which I think will help us all.

Dr. Downey's motion was put and carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Chair would say a word as a matter of privilege. The Chair heard you adopt this morning general parliamentary law. He understood that that excluded any usage that might be peculiar to either Church. I have seen the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, do some most absurd things in parliamentary law. The Chair has even seen a paper presented with the request that it be laid on the table. I asked the purpose of Dr. Du Bose's motion. I would remind you that in some bodies they require that the paper lie on the table for a given time; some such rule as that, or as suggested by our distinguished friend. The next item is that we consider the action of the General Conferences seriatim. The action of which Conference will you take under consideration? The Secretary will read the action of the Southern General Conference. Shall we read it section by section?

Bishop Denny: My understanding of that rule was that there

were certain agreements in the action of the two General Conferences. That was the situation when the motion was made (there are certain agreements in the action of the two General Conferences; there are certain divergences), that we have a statement from the Chairman of each Commission in the order of their adoption, seriatim—a statement of his understanding of those agreements and those differences.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Secretary will read the first section of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Bishop Denny: Really that is not what we tried to present here, but that there should be a statement made by the Chairman of each Commission of what he understands to be the points of agreement in the acts of each General Conference and of what he understands to be the points of divergence. That was the action we took last night.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Chair is following the instructions of the paper sent by Bishop Denny and Dr. Blake, which says that we shall consider the action of each General Conference seriatim, and then it is put down in pencil "To ascertain the points of agreement and divergences between the two General Conferences, but particularly the points of divergence from the action at Chattanooga."

Edgar Blake: That statement is exactly in form and in content as the motion was made. I called attention at the time the motion was made to the fact that it was indefinite and would doubtless create confusion in the minds of the Commission. My mind on the purport of the motion is precisely that of Bishop Denny—namely, that we might develop at this time those things upon which the two General Conference actions are agreed and those matters upon which there is divergence of action, in order that, having developed those divergences, we might approach them, if possible, to secure reconciliation.

W. J. Young: My recollection agrees with that. The purpose was to get at these agreements and divergences. We discussed what might be the better plan to do that. We agreed that the better way was to bring forward these points seriatim—the recommendations of each General Conference—so that, considering them one by one, we might the better understand wherein we agreed and where there are divergences.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Then the Secretary will read the first section of the action taken by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Oklahoma City in 1914.

At the suggestion of Dr. Goucher, Secretaries Harris and Thomas read the papers from their respective General Conferences.

62 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : That completes the reading, which completes the order placed in the hands of the Chairman. He awaits your further pleasure.

On motion, it was voted to adjourn, and the session closed, with the benediction pronounced by Bishop Cooke.

THIRD DAY, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1916

The Joint Commission was called to order at 9:40 A.M. in the chapel of the Mount Vernon Place Church by Bishop Candler.

A hymn was sung, "Come, Thou Almighty King."

Bishop Hamilton offered prayer.

Bishop Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, we have been having souvenir copies of the Bible with interesting associations here, from time to time, from which we have had the Scriptures read. It is my privilege this morning to bring from the American University the proof sheets of Wesley's "Notes" which we have bound and which have come down to us through one of the Presidents of the Wesleyan Conference. The proof sheets are with his own corrections of the book that I suppose is in all our libraries. I have placed it in the hands of the brother who is to read this morning, that we may have the Scriptures from the proof sheets which came from Mr. Wesley's own hand.

A. F. Watkins read the Scriptures from John, chapter x.

W. N. Ainsworth offered prayer.

The roll was called, showing as present from the Methodist Episcopal Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve. Laymen: George Warren Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Ira E. Robinson, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr. From the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Bishops E. E. Hoss, Collins Denny, Edwin D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Ministers: Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, Percy D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, John R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

J. J. Wallace was seated in the place of J. R. Day, resigned from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Secretary Harris read the minutes of yesterday afternoon's session, and they were approved.

Bishop Cranston took the chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Committee on Organ-

ization and Procedure will report what business we have on hand this morning.

J. F. Goucher: A question of privilege. I move that the Committee on Organization and Procedure be authorized to make arrangements for the service at the grave of Bishop Asbury on Sunday afternoon.

This motion prevailed.

Bishop Cranston: Has the Committee on Organization and Procedure any order to report for the day?

Edgar Blake: Your Committee on Organization and Procedure recommends:

1. That the following be added to the rules of the Joint Commission: "Any of the foregoing rules may be suspended at any time by unanimous consent."

2. We recommend that the following subjects be taken up in order by the Joint Commission for general discussion and that not more than one session be given to each subject:

(a) The General Conference, its composition and its judicial and legislative functions.

(b) The Quadrennial Conferences, their number, boundaries, and powers.

(c) The status of the colored membership in the reorganized Church.

3. We recommend that, following the general discussion, all the subjects be referred to appropriate committees for further consideration and representation.

H. W. Rogers: My recollection of the action had was that before discussion takes place these respective committees should be appointed in order that they may have the benefit of the discussion without committing themselves personally to any distinct position in reference to any of the questions which may arise.

Edgar Blake: I do recall very distinctly that there was a suggestion in the discussion to the effect as stated by Judge Rogers—namely, that these committees should be appointed previous to the discussion in order that they might listen to the discussion more carefully. I do recall, however, that it was pointed out that, inasmuch as these committees are to be appointed by the Joint Commission—that is, by the separate Commissions—that would involve a break in our proceedings and consume some time. There was no action taken other than that stated by the Secretary, as the notes show.

E. B. Chappell: I doubt if we ought to bind ourselves to discuss each one of these subjects just one session.

Edgar Blake read: "We recommend that the following subjects be taken up in order by the Joint Commission for general discussion and that not more than one session"—

E. B. Chappell: That is what I object to. Why not more, if we need to? Why pass a rule like that?

64 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

Bishop Denny: One purpose of that was that we might cover as nearly as possible the questions at issue. And if we should begin and debate on any question and then find it prolonged, we might not be able to hold together as many members of the Joint Commission as would be needed to go over all the ground concerned. So that the Committee thought that we should at least give, for information, one of the sessions of the Commission to the discussion of each of these subjects. Of course, if it be wise to continue, after having given three sessions, any one of these subjects for discussion, it could be done.

W. J. Young: The object, as I understand it, in this preliminary discussion was not to have a thorough discussion of the subject, after all, but simply to bring forward the views of the different members of the Commission on each of these subjects, so that these committees would know the temper of the body in such way that they would be able to bring in a wise report based on the actual situation. When the reports are brought in, then the discussion will be, if necessary, prolonged. But we wanted in the opening, where it was necessary merely to get the information before the committee, that that should be done; and we thought it need not be prolonged at this time.

Edgar Blake: I move that the report be considered *seriatim*.

This was agreed to, and the items thus considered were respectively adopted.

Edwin M. Randall: I move as an amendment that in the consideration of these subjects speeches be limited to five minutes. This will be a special rule applying to this only. I would like to state my reason if I have a second to my motion. [The motion was seconded.] It is this, that as this is not a debate preliminary to action, but a discussion for illumination, five minutes is ample time for any one of us to state his position in regard to any of these subjects. In the next place, we shall have only about two hours for each subject. We cannot begin the discussion for this session in time to have more than two hours. It is possible that with the ten-minute limit the two hours might be taken up by twelve men. With so few having an opportunity to speak during a session, it is not at all probable that there will be presented any proportionate representation of the different views that are entertained. And a discussion that shall not represent the views held here, with reasonable completeness and proportion, had better not be given, because it would leave us without knowing the state of mind of this body as a whole. Therefore, that double the number may speak and because five minutes is sufficient for one to express himself adequately concerning these subjects, I believe these addresses should be limited to five minutes.

T. N. Ivey: Since the time for the discussion of these ques-

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 65

tions has been limited, I think it entirely proper to limit the length of these speeches. I am heartily in favor of that amendment.

The amendment proposed by Dr. Randall was adopted, 26 to 16.

The motion as amended was adopted as a whole.

Bishop Denny: Will you let me complete the report committed to a subcommittee with power to act touching the watch night service? Bishop Murrah, selecting such assistants as he may desire, without reference to the special branch of the Church to which they belong, will have charge of the first half of the watch night service. Bishop Hamilton, selecting in the same way such assistants as he needs, will have charge of the concluding half of the watch night service. The services will begin at 9:30 at the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The order of the day was taken up and read, as follows:

The General Conference, its composition and its judicial and legislative functions.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair would like to understand how you desire to proceed, whether in committee of the whole or in Joint Commission, and whether interruptions shall be allowed. This is informal. There is no motion or resolution. It is simply turning on the light.

Bishop McDowell: I think it is the judgment of the Committee that, without formally going into session as a committee of the whole, we should virtually proceed as though we were in session thus rather than in formal session as a Joint Commission; and that, without a motion at this time, the subject should be considered as before us, in the fact that it has been brought before us in the reports of the two General Conferences and the Joint Commission of the Commission on Federation; and that this discussion should not be a debate on a motion, but a discussion of the subject without a motion pending.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then, of course, the Chair is to recognize brethren as they may claim the floor, assigning the floor and closing the remarks at the end of five minutes. Proceed, brethren.

J. M. Moore: I am in favor of a General Conference with one house only. I think that the two-house General Conference would not be desirable in any sense. I think it is in a way unwieldy; that it is cumbersome; that it would delay legislation unnecessarily; and that there is really no protection, especially, for either side in having two houses in the General Conference. I believe that the General Conference should be a lawmaking body, with no powers to elect anybody to any office whatsoever.

66 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

I believe that all matters of doctrine and of ritual and of the order of worship and of a hymnal belong to the General Conference. I believe that all requirements for membership should be determined by the General Conference. I am also of the opinion that the powers and duties and prerogatives of the bishops of the Church should be determined by the General Conference. I say this because I think that we should have a general superintendency rather than a regional superintendency or a diocesan superintendency. If we have a general superintendency, I think then that the powers and duties and prerogatives of the bishops should be determined by the General Conference. I believe that the ministry of the Church is a connectional matter in view of the transfer system. I believe that we ought to have a transfer system, so that any man who is a clerical member of a Conference could be transferred from any Conference in Methodism to any other Conference in Methodism. And if we should have such a transfer system, then I think that the requirements for admission into the ministry and the course of study for the ministry should be matters to be determined by the General Conference. The course of study in our own Church is made out by the College of Bishops. As I understand it, in the Methodist Episcopal Church the supervision of this course of study is very largely in the hands of the bishops. I believe also that the trial and the appeals of bishops and preachers, that the law regarding the trial and the appeals of bishops and preachers should be a matter that the General Conference should handle. I believe that the duties and prerogatives of the various Conferences should be outlined and specifically stated.

A Commissioner: What do you mean by the prerogatives?

J. M. Moore: I mean that the rights of a Conference as regards some other Conference should be determined by the General Conference. The General Conference, in my mind, should be charged with the establishment and the forming of the constitutions of the various General Boards and also have charge of such matters of the Jurisdictional Boards as would have relation to the General Boards. Whatever matters are auxiliary to the General Boards, of course, should be acted on by the General Conference. This brings an outline, as distinctly as I am able to state it, of the things that I would like to see the General Conference handle, because I consider them connectional.

J. F. Goucher: It is my judgment that the General Conference should elect its own presiding officer or officers, and the presiding should not be done as a prerogative to some other function or office. I think also that the General Conference should not be the judge of the legality of its own actions or their constitutionality.

Bishop Mouzon: I come at once to the crux of the whole

matter, to that point which to me seems to be of critical importance. I think that if we are able to agree touching this matter many other matters of detail will work themselves out without serious difficulty. We suggest that neither the General Conference nor any Quadrennial Conference be vested with final authority to interpret the constitutionality of its own action. As the General Conference is a representative body, to give to it power to interpret the constitutionality of its own actions is to create an un-American and undemocratic institution. It is to govern the Church by an oligarchy. There must be some supreme court that has continuous existence to pass upon the constitutionality of General Conference legislation. I am not saying that that supreme court must be the College of Bishops or, if some of you please, the Board of Bishops. I am saying that there must be some supreme court. It is not the doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that the "limited veto" which bishops have, or preferably "the power to arrest legislation," inheres in the episcopacy. By General Conference action passed down to the Annual Conference this power which the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, now have was conferred by the Annual Conferences on the bishops, following legislation in 1870. It would interest some of you if you could turn to the great paper which was presented by Leroy M. Lee in which the doctrine is set forth that the veto does not inhere in the episcopacy. There must be some superior court to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation. There I take my stand. There I will stand.

D. G. Downey: If Bishop Mouzon had been putting that in the form of a motion, I would have been glad to support it most heartily. I find myself, notwithstanding the practice of our General Conference, in agreement with the statement that has just been made.

Bishop Cooke: As I suppose nearly every one here knows where I have previously stood upon that subject, I need not go into it further. I wish simply to show that this idea is not new in the Methodist Episcopal Church, that it is not foreign to its councils nor to its chief men from the beginning. In 1820 the General Conference adopted a similar idea to the proposition before us. In 1824 the General Conference did a similar thing. In 1836 the General Conference adopted a judicial decision that there was no way to decide a controverted question. In 1848 similar action was taken. In 1852 they said they were fully of the opinion that provision should be made at that time for a judicial department in the general administration of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It amounts to nothing that such a department was not and has not been constructed by the General Conference. The fact that from the beginning such a demand

68 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

has voiced itself in the Church is evidence of the need of it. In 1865 the General Conference took it up again, and later on, until finally they adopt a course of procedure of that kind, all the time realizing that it was an abnormal situation for any body to be the sole judge of its own acts. It is un-American and, as the citations from the Journals show, it is really un-Methodistic. The Methodist Episcopal Church from the very beginning has not been satisfied with the situation. Of course I should be only too glad to acquiesce in anything which would bring about such a change in the constitution of the Church.

Bishop Hoss: This matter has been agitated from the very beginning. Most of you are aware of the disturbance in the General Conference of 1820 which caused Joshua Soule to resign his election to the episcopacy. McKendree was not present with them in the Conference room on that day. When he came back, on Monday morning, he claimed the floor. He read an amazing paper to the General Conference, in which he informed them that the action that they had taken on what is known as the "Suspended Resolutions" was unconstitutional and he would not pay any attention to it himself nor advise anybody else to do so. You know how it finally went. That General Conference would have run clean over Soule by himself. It was only the personality of McKendree and the tremendous hold he had on the Church that enabled him to talk in this peremptory way and make his talk good. I should like to see, from a convenient distance, any modern bishop undertake to do it! In 1854 the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, under the leadership of W. A. Smith, did invest the bishops with the general veto power by a mere act of legislation; and that continued to 1870, when the committee to whom that matter was referred brought in the report of which Bishop Mouzon has spoken, written by Leroy M. Lee, a nephew of Jesse Lee and having many of the same qualities about him as the famous pioneer, in which he declared that the veto power is not inherent in the episcopacy and that the action of 1854 bestowing it by mere legislation upon the episcopacy was unconstitutional, and proposing an amendment to the constitution which carried in our Church in 1870 by a virtually unanimous vote, first in a General Conference and then in the Annual Conferences, giving the bishop a very limited veto power. They have no veto power over general legislation. It is simply in regard to constitutional questions, and it is merely a power to arrest at the time. If they veto an action, the General Conference can pass it again, and then it goes out to the Annual Conferences. The true theory in Methodism is that the ultimate power of determining the constitutionality of any question resides in the eldership of our Church. I am very much opposed to this idea of a supreme court. It is

a fifth wheel. There are two or three reasons why I am opposed to it. In the first place, it is creating an additional piece of machinery in the Church for which there is no use at all. If any unconstitutional question arises, the bishop, or whoever may have been elected to preside, must retire and allow the supreme court to come forth and decide whether the action is unconstitutional; or else there must be a delayed decision, which in the matter of constitutionality is a very dangerous thing. I believe that the only persons who are competent to sit as judges of the constitutionality of any actions are persons amenable to the General Conference for the proper discharge of their duties. If you should put laymen on this court, the General Conference could not touch them. A layman could do as he pleases as far as that is concerned.

H. M. Du Bose: I am very decidedly on record as favoring the type of General Conference that I have myself described as Asburian, because it existed during the time of Asbury's patriarchate—that is, of his incumbency of the episcopacy. I want a General Conference that will be constitutional. I am in accord with the idea of giving to the Regional Conferences all the power necessary to effectively administer local affairs. Preferably I would like to see the bishops elected directly by the General Conference. I should, however, acquiesce in the idea of their being selected or nominated by the Regional Conferences, to be confirmed by the General Conference. But most surely my idea of the episcopacy for the reorganized Church is a connectional episcopacy, each man as much a bishop in Maine as in Florida and as much so in Oregon and Washington as he would be in Arizona or Texas. I would like to see a General Conference with the order of administration something like we have had, restricted to this extent. I would have under the General Conference a connectional Foreign Mission Board; the Home and Domestic Missions I would have administered in the Regional Conferences. I would have an Educational Board to deal with educational questions connected with universities and with the general policy of education, but all educational administration in connection with colleges and subsidiary schools to be relegated to the Regional Conferences. I would have no connectional Church Extension Board. It is local work which should be administered by the Regional Conferences. I would have the General Conference deal always with the question of membership, of course, always with the question of ritual, and always with the matter of ministerial and even of lay character. I would have this General Conference under constitutional restriction and would have its constitution written. It has been said that the day of written constitutions is past, as is the day for written confessions; but we soon shall have made a day when it will be neces-

sary to have a written constitution. Write it *in extenso* and make it as definite as possible. Such a General Conference, connectional throughout, I prefer, with the bishops selected by the said General Conference, though I should acquiesce in the idea of their being nominated on a scale arranged for in the Regional Conferences and confirmed by the General Conference.

Bishop Cooke: These data taken from the General Conference Journals may be at the service of the Committee, should they require it or desire it.

Bishop McDowell: There are three or four questions here in this general topic. One relates to the composition of the General Conference. Upon that I suppose we could easily reach an agreement. One relates to the legislative powers of the General Conference. Upon that an agreement would not be quite so easy, for the case of these legislative powers quickly runs into the constitutional limitations that may hedge these powers about and quickly runs into the possible powers that may be given to Jurisdictional Conferences. Now, all that we have said up to this time keeps a little bit away from perhaps the real crux of the matter. We shall have sometime, and we shall have before we get very far, to come to close quarters with the powers of the General Conference, not primarily as related to its power to interpret the constitutionality of its own actions, but primarily its legislative powers as affecting the ministry, including the episcopacy, the membership, the discipline of the Church. We are using the word "reorganization" perhaps with a little undue emphasis. We are not commissioners on the reorganization of the Church. We are commissioners for the unification of the Church, reorganization being the possible process. And in the determination of the powers of the General Conference we have to consider pretty closely whether we are going to make a Conference that may simply be a federation or whether we are going to make a Conference that shall have real authority in the whole Church. If we do not make such a General Conference, then we have made a number of Churches sustaining a federated relation. This, it seems to me, is where we have to come. Personally I believe it the utmost degree of local autonomy consistent with and—shall I say as expressing my own faith?—subordinate or subject to the connectional universal feature of the Church as a whole. I should not like to see any General Conference invested with such limited powers as to make it virtually a council or hedged about in its jurisdiction in such a fashion that virtually all the real authority of the Church is lodged in groups.

F. M. Thomas: I think we are committed absolutely, by the action of both our General Conferences, to unification through reorganization. I think that both Conferences have made that mandatory. I do not think that reorganization is a possible

plan; it is the only plan. I will go a step farther and say this—I will use the language used by my good friend, Dr. Du Bose, the other day—that it will not be by a piece of patchwork, just trimming the lines of our present Methodism and sewing all of them together; but it will be by putting into the melting pot the present American Episcopal Methodism, preserving all that is best in its polity and ideas and usages, and, asking for divine guidance, formulating a constitutional American Methodism that will survive the shocks and meet the demands of the present day. I believe that the two present Methodisms are the two most vigorous Churches on the American continent. But I have serious doubts whether Methodism, which I love with all my heart, can survive, even with its present commanding position, unless through a readjustment. Personally I am opposed to change. But the most dangerous thing is a static order. And therefore I come to what I consider the crucial question. I do not think we shall have large divergence with regard to the General Conference, because we must have a General Conference that will function in regard to general principles. But I agree with Bishop Mouzon that the fundamental question is the power to interpret the acts of this Conference. I do not fully agree with Bishop Hoss. I believe that there ought to be bishops on this court, but it ought to be a composite court. I will say this, in the presence of one of the most distinguished Federal judges in the United States, because I believe the tendency of men in a set order is in time to become static. There is growing up among the foremost lawyers of the United States a restlessness in reference to the judiciary. Men isolated from life have the tendency to become static. I would favor bishops in this supreme court—they are by virtue of their position better fitted than anybody else to pass on these matters—yet both the laity and the traveling preachers ought to be represented there. It ought to be a small court to represent the mind of the Church, and not of one particular class of the Church. If we can formulate a small court—and I believe we can do it—and make it amenable to the General Conference, we shall have a court whose decisions will command the confidence of American Methodism and be effective under a written constitution.

Bishop Hoss: I would ask the last speaker whether he would permit members of that supreme court to be members of the General Conference?

F. M. Thomas: That is a matter of detail to be considered later.

Bishop Cooke: Dr. Thomas stated that he would make this judicial council amenable to the General Conference. I would like to have that explained; because if the Judicial Conference is itself finally to be amenable to the General Conference, what

is the use of a Judicial Conference? I would make the Judicial Conference amenable to the body of elders.

F. M. Thomas: My reply was in answer to the objection that you cannot make a body of this kind amenable. Any one familiar with jurisprudence knows that the courts that have been created by corporate institutions can always be made amenable in some form.

Bishop Cooke: But the Judicial Conference should be amenable to the Church and not to the General Conference.

Bishop Hamilton: I wish we could forget all the causes and all the occasions that have made our conditions of seventy-two years and that we could be put back into that unification, if you please, that we had before our division. That cannot be done wholly. Secondly, I am in my disposition subject to all rational consideration of any of these questions that come up in their detail. But I would like to keep Methodism where it is—first, in its doctrines; secondly, in its form of government; thirdly, in its usages. I see no reason why we cannot have unification instead of federation. I do not think it is necessary, in order to unify, to go into any very great change that will affect any of these three common grounds on which we now stand. I am in favor of this body, the two Churches having equal numbers, twenty-five of you and twenty-five of us. I do not want the idea to obtain of any "putting it over" on either body. I am in favor of the composition of the General Conference that will give the same representation there that we have here, forgetting all about numbers and bringing an equal representation from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with that of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the organization of that General Conference; for that is what is to be practically the case when we go back to our Conferences to decide this question. Either one of the Conferences can settle the whole business, either General Conference having the authority to accept or reject what we decided here. I would like to see that done. Now, as to detail.

Bishop Mouzon: I do not quite understand what Bishop Hamilton means. I supposed that some ratio would prevail throughout the organized Church, but I am not quite sure what he means.

Bishop Hamilton: I am perfectly willing that all these matters of detail shall be thus arranged afterwards. I am perfectly willing that the same thing should obtain in the first General Conference which obtains here as to numbers—that there shall be an equal number of delegates from your body, and we have a General Conference in which we have only equal numbers represented. That is simply in harmony with what we now have in this Joint Commission. It is simply in harmony with what will be the results of the action of this body; for we will go back to each of the Churches, and each of the Churches will settle the

question. So I see no objection to that. I am heartily in favor of the supreme court. The relation of that supreme court to the General Conference and these other questions that have been raised by Dr. Thomas are subsidiary questions. If we could get into the one Church without very much reorganization, we would only bring ourselves to where we now are. You are very largely satisfied with these three things I have named upon which you now stand, and so are we. Why go into any very fundamental changes under the term "reorganization" when really what we are satisfied with now we would like to see go on. Next to the good spirit which brings us together here is the genius, the peculiar genius, of our Methodism, which is our connectional system. It inheres more in the plan of itinerant general superintendency than anywhere else. I would like to see no more solid North, no more solid South, but unification in which your bishops shall preside over our territory and ours over yours and we sit in one common conference of bishops. Then all these geographic matters and local matters that come up, occasioned either by prejudice or by actual conditions, could be readily adjusted; let them be matters of detail.

E. C. Reeves: I do not believe any layman has yet spoken. I want to do two things. I want to indorse and emphasize, if possible, the speech that was made and the sentiments expressed by the bishop who just took his seat. At the same time I wish to criticise what my friend, our Secretary (Dr. Thomas), has said. My dear sir, what we put into the melting pot is just what we are going to take out. I do not think this is a time for revolution in Methodism. You can talk about uneasiness pervading the whole country as to our polity. Can you point out any Protestant Church on earth that has ever been as prosperous as our Methodisms have been under our episcopal form of government? Can you point to a time when they were ever more prosperous than now? Where do you see danger? I do not see it. There is an overlapping. There is trouble between us because we are occupying the same field. There is friction on that account. We are here to adjust those conditions. Get up a single Church, and those conditions will disappear. We are not here to revolutionize the polity of Methodism, as I understand. I believe in our polities, which are alike. I love them. I love our system of our general superintendency. We have prospered in a way that has proved to me that we have the best Church polities of any Church in Christendom. I am against revolution. Let us adjust our conditions. That is what we are here for; not to create a new Church with new doctrines, polities, or anything of the kind, but simply to adjust our conditions and get rid of friction. When we have done that I think we have done the will of God. If ever he has favored a Church on earth, it has been our Method-

ism. That is history. Nor do I believe, in this new Church, in reducing our general superintendents; I want a full bishop. I want a big bishop; I want one I can look up to, not down upon. I am a democrat in theory more than I am in practice. Whenever you scatter our powers and privileges among all the millions we have, they are dissipated. I believe in concentration of power. And this thing of trying to cut away power from the episcopacy has been done in our own Church, not so much in yours. I am opposed to it. I believe in a full-fledged bishop. He is the man I want. We have prospered under the supervision of these general superintendents with existing powers. I do not know why we cannot continue so to prosper. I do not want a Church with little bishops. Let us have no such experiment.

Bishop Hoss: I think Colonel Reeves and Bishop Cranston are the only old soldiers here, except Dr. Lamar.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I am very much opposed to any supreme court of Methodism on constitutional questions. That is really what the suggestions of several members to-day have been. I do not care whether that court is to be amenable or not amenable to the General Conference. What are you going to do with the judges of that court? Are you going to appoint them each time that the General Conference meets, like the Judiciary Committee of the Conference of the Church, North, but to sit between Conferences? If you are, then you are going to have a supreme court that in the General Conference has already passed upon your constitutional questions. Are you going to make them like the Federal judiciary, appointed for life? Then they will be out of touch with the people. I want none of those things. I agree with Bishop Hoss. I want to hold fast to the old things, just as far as we can. When there was only one Church, primarily the General Conference passed upon constitutional questions. I am in thorough accord with the thought that there ought to be an appeal in proper cases from the General Conference. It ought not to be that any one member of a General Conference, for instance, should have a right of appeal to some other body. But, under certain proper limitations, there ought to be a right of appeal from the General Conference, on constitutional questions, to some other body. Where shall it go? I agree that it ought to go down to the Annual and lay electoral Conferences. My belief, is, gentlemen, as we are dealing with the question of God's will, who loved and died for all men and desires to bring all men to see the light as God has given us to see the light or desires that we shall see it, that you can find in some little backwoods Church a lay or ministerial delegate who will know, from the twenty-second chapter of Matthew, what is best for the Church just as much as the greatest bishop that ever lived. Those are the men that I want to see in Annual and lay electoral

Conferences when the question is really important enough to send it down to them to pass upon the question whether or not that which has been adopted by the General Conference is the thing which they want to adopt as forming a part of the polity of the Methodist Church. That is what I believe the Methodist Church is: a Church of those everyday, God-fearing people. I believe that a committee to be appointed following our debate here this morning, if we follow the matter along that line, can bring in a report that probably will be satisfactory to every man in this Commission. But if there is going to be a supreme court of some kind on those questions, some men that are going to be put up above other men, some men that are as undemocratic as Mr. Reeves is democratic, we will have trouble constantly throughout our Connection.

Edgar Blake: As the representatives from our own Church know, I have consistently opposed the proposition for a supreme court in our own Church. While it is true, as has been stated by my friend Bishop Cooke, that this matter has been before the Church constantly, from the beginning almost constantly, and that there always has been a party in the Church in favor of a supreme court, it is true that in both cases where this subject of a supreme court has been submitted to the body of the elder-ship they have rejected it. In our own Church, although the matter has come before us on various occasions, a majority has always been against the proposition. Now a different question is arising in this new proposition. We are proposing to create a General Conference with full legislative power over all distinc-tively connectional matters. We are proposing to create a series of Quadrennial Conferences with full authority over all distinc-tively local affairs. There will also be a twilight zone of uncer-tainty, define these powers as definitely and clearly as you may. I can easily see that there is going to be a need of a Conference or body of some kind to sit somewhere that can pass upon the acts not only of the General Conference, but of these Quadren-nial Conferences, to make certain that neither Conference shall exceed its constitutional rights or violate the rights of any other Conference. That is what we need a supreme court for. It is not simply a question of establishing a court to pass upon the constitutionality of the acts of the General Conference. We shall need such a court quite as much to make certain that the Quadrennial Conferences do not exceed their constitutional pow-ers in the matter. For that reason I am heartily in favor, under this proposed system, of a supreme court to pass upon the con-stitutionality of the acts of the several Conferences when they come properly before the court. I am also convinced that the court should have o'er powers. It seems to me an appellate court, if you please. Let me state a case. For instance, in our

own Church at the present time if an Annual Conference shall take exception to the ruling of the bishop on any matter of law, there is no body to which that Annual Conference can take its appeal except to our General Conference. There is no body to which an Annual Conference can take an appeal from the decision of a bishop except to our General Conference. Sometimes that involves a wait of two, three, or four years. The matter ought to be determined at an early date. If a preacher is on trial and he desires to take an appeal upon a local question, he cannot take an appeal except to our General Conference. I do not quite know how it is in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I am making the point that we need a body somewhere that can sit in the interim of General Conferences and pass upon these questions that may come to it. That brings me to speak of the composition of this court. I do not believe that it should be composed of the body of bishops. I am further inclined to think that it would be wiser if no bishops were on the court, because it is inevitable that questions will come before such a court in which the episcopacy is involved. I do not like the thought that those whose interests are involved shall be members of such a court. I am not quite clear that there is anything in the episcopal office that necessarily fits a man for the discharge of judicial duties. If any man is put on that court, he ought to be put on it, not by virtue of his office, but by virtue of his training and his fitness for the tasks that he is to be called on to discharge.

A. J. Lamar: It seems to me that in dealing with this question it is important that our committee, when it shall be appointed, shall act absolutely without any prejudice arising from what has been the custom in one Church or in the other. Our Methodism has been wonderfully successful. We do not throw away a piece of machinery as long as it will do the work as well as any other machinery in existence. We discard our machinery in manufacturing enterprises only when something is presented to us which commends itself to our judgment as capable of doing more, better, and cheaper work than the machine which we have been using heretofore. Now, I think that our committee should look, in each question that comes before it—for this is largely a question of machinery—and see how has the Methodist Episcopal Church been working with the machinery which it has? How has the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, been working with the machinery it has used in this particular? If they differ, which piece of machinery commends itself to us as the better piece, no matter which Church has had it? I think that our work should be largely a comparison of this character. We do not want to do anything revolutionary. There is absolutely no necessity for throwing away anything in Methodism which has contin-

ued to do and which promises, so far as we can see, to do in the future the work for which that thing was designed. We want to get the best in the unified Church, if happily in the providence of God we succeed in this unification. We want the very best machinery. We should avoid the revolutionary idea that, in order to secure that best piece of machinery, it is absolutely necessary that we should throw on the scrap heap all that we have used. We want and we need a great many of these things. I confess that personally—and I can speak with great freedom, for I am not a bishop and at my age will not be a bishop, and my brethren will bear me witness that I have never wanted to be a bishop—I believe in a strong episcopacy. Personally I do not see how you will get any supreme court selected by the General Conference or any other Conference which will answer so well as the bishops of the Church, with the final appeal to the Annual Conferences. I do not. These men we select as our leaders—we select them because we believe that they have the qualifications which fit them to be leaders. If they are not that kind of men, it is our fault. We select them. And where your General Conference sifts men it picks out and elects to the episcopacy the men whom it believes to be the best men for the leadership of the Church. How shall we make any wiser selection for the supreme court? It is dangerous to elect too many bishops. You elect ten bishops, and you are more apt to have weak men in that ten than if you elect one, two, or three bishops. It is a dangerous thing. I believe that the less machinery we have, the better. I believe that the best plan is the plan of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South—a suspensive veto by the College of Bishops, which refers the whole matter to the Annual Conferences for their final adjudication.

I. G. Penn: I am exceedingly interested in the unification of the Churches. If I were to assign a selfish reason for it, I would say that I think my people have everything to gain by unification if properly consummated. Since the General Conference of 1916 I have been making a careful study of the divergences of the two Churches. I have tried to keep an open mind as to the necessity for concession and the wisdom of locating the strong points of each Church, so that they may be taken into the unified Church, thus making the reorganized Church a stronger Church. I have, therefore, been studying as a Commissioner where I might concede to our brethren of the South. I have decided from the history of my own Church, as I have observed it in General Conferences, that we ought to have some tribunal outside the General Conference of the Church to decide upon the constitutionality of the acts of the General Conference. If I had not that opinion prior to

our last General Conference, I should have it now because of certain history in my own Church covering the quadrennium from the General Conference of 1912 to the last. In the General Conference of 1912, at Minneapolis, a constitutional query was raised by Dr. Blake as to a matter that had passed that General Conference by a vote supposed to be constitutional and therefore was to be handed down to the Annual Conferences and voted upon. Dr. Blake's query was not then disposed of, as there was no time to decide it, because it was raised in the closing session of the General Conference. There was no body with power in the interim of the General Conference to decide upon the constitutionality of the action of 1912. It remained unsettled until the General Conference of 1916. That General Conference decided that the Bishop for Races and Languages proposition did receive the constitutional vote, and it was restored to its original status of 1912 as a measure that should have gone down to the Annual Conferences approved by the General Conference. But it had gone past its time of usefulness. It will be seen, therefore, that the will of five hundred and fifty voters in the affirmative was thwarted by the query of one man as to the validity of the action when passed, because only the General Conference could decide upon such questions when raised. I believe we ought to have a tribunal to decide questions of the constitution in the interim of the General Conference. I do not say that such should be lodged in the Board or College of Bishops or in the Committee on Judiciary, sitting in the interim of the General Conference, with the final power to decide. How such a body is to be created (its members, powers, etc.) can be left for future detail. I think there is strength in the position of our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, right here, which as a member and a Commissioner of the Methodist Episcopal Church I am perfectly willing to say amen to and to put it into the constitution of the unified Church.

J. W. Van Cleve: We seem to have strayed somewhat from the composition and powers of the General Conference to those of this supreme court. Concerning the General Conference itself I would like to say a word. I would be distinctly in favor of a General Conference that is, without any question in anybody's mind, general. I was about to say absolutely general, but I will not say that for fear some one might understand me to say generally absolute. The difficulty with this matter of this supreme court proposition in our Church has always been a difficulty in agreeing as to the composition of the supreme court. Almost everybody seems to have desired something of the kind. But when it came to the concrete and practical application of the thing, we could not find

any form of it that we actually did desire. It has seemed just a little intolerable to our people to erect a Board of Bishops into a supreme court that would have power for a considerable period of time to subject a considerable majority of the Church to the will of a minority of it and would put them, in a sense, in control of the Church itself. To put it concretely, suppose we had one hundred people as a kind of a measuring unit. It might be possible for a bare majority of the Board of Bishops and thirty-four people out of one hundred in the Methodist Church actually to hold in suspense and prevent the realization of the will of sixty-six people in the Church and so rule the whole Church in that proportion. I think our people would not like to have the Board of Bishops have that power. There has been a little indisposition to create a body that would sit during the sessions of the General Conference as a kind of superior body to have oversight over it. That arises possibly from the jealousy of the General Conference itself, which does not like to have its powers restricted. The question was raised—a very pertinent question, which has not been answered—whether we should make such a court as that out of the members of the General Conference or create it entirely outside the body. I think you will realize instantly that it would be altogether inadvisable to put into the supreme court, or any other kind of arresting body that might hold up and virtually nullify the will of that General Conference, people who were a part of it. I think it would not be advisable to have any portion of the General Conference as members of that supreme court; and when you begin to state it, you find yourself confronted with difficulties on every hand. I have a kind of feeling that, what is rather peculiar in human affairs generally, the desire for a supreme court has grown exactly in inverse proportion to its necessity, because my observation of the actual dealings of the General Conference with the constitutional questions that have been presented to it within my own memory of the acts of the Church has been this: that if there has been a leaning in any direction, it has always been in the direction of conservatism. And you will find that behind that is a change in the temper of the whole American people in the direction of conservatism. It appears to me that if there were the same kind of natural, radical temper and disposition in the American people and Methodist people that existed half a century ago we would not be here. The attitude of the people, the pressure behind us, is precisely opposite to that which was present in times past. And it is the pressure of the mass that makes things. The pressure of the mass of the people is a thing that cannot be resisted permanently.

R. E. Blackwell: I agree with what Brother Van Cleve has said. But I think we must bear in mind this: that it is not what is ideally best, but what our people will receive when we carry it back to them. Personally I agree with him that his Church is becoming more and more conservative and that there is not very much necessity for this supreme court. But I believe that if we of the South went back to our people and did not have something like a suspensive veto power or like a supreme court, our people would be greatly alarmed and would feel that probably they had better not go into this reorganized Church. And we must remember in all our work here that we are to refer our action to our Conferences; and we must keep in mind what we can get them to accept rather than what we think would be best for them to accept. Therefore I think we must certainly have something like our suspensive veto or something like a supreme court. I think that we ought to give to the Jurisdictional Conferences as large liberty of a legislative character and of every other character as we possibly can and should give as small power to the General Conference as is consistent with our connectional system. I do not object to leaving a large twilight zone. We must not try to settle everything. We must give an opportunity for growth. And that growth is likely to be not general, but in sections. We ought to have the power to try out things in our different Jurisdictional Conferences, and we should not attempt to form the whole Church upon the same model and plan. I think we can very well remember what has happened in our own government. If it had been understood one hundred years ago, or when our Constitution was formed, that things we have seen come to pass would come to pass, we should never have had any United States government. Give us opportunity to grow. Therefore, I say, I should restrict the powers of the General Conference to the fewest possible subjects consistent with the connectional system idea and give the largest possible powers to the Jurisdictional Conferences.

Bishop Candler: I am a very strong believer in strong government. I do not know any use for government that is feeble. I do not want any function of my body to be feeble. I want a stout arm, an agile foot, and a clear eye. We do not want any feeble government anywhere. But I want government, when its powers are limited, to stay within those limits. When it gets out of its orbit, it runs afoul of other governments and produces confusion. There was an inharmoniousness in our country when South Carolina wished to exercise too general powers. I will not say in this presence that the Federal government, on the other hand, ever got too particular. But I will say that the danger was never in making the Federal government or the State govern-

ment too strong, but it was in now one and now the other undertaking to attend to somebody else's business. In my State the coroner is a very strong person. He is the only man who can arrest a judge. I want a strong coroner. He can bury the dead, but he is the only man that can arrest the judge. Now and then the judge needs arrest. I want the General Conference to be strong. But as you extend the territory of the republic and the extent of the Church is widened, you have got to distribute powers to local jurisdiction, or else you will put so much strain on the center that you will break down the very unity you are desiring. Some of you propose to have a Church that would include all the world. I do not much believe in "world Churches." But suppose you did make a "world Church." Your General Conference ought not to be determining all the minute things for the Chinese. They are very curiously and wonderfully made, and they ought to have pretty large liberty within their own national or race consciousness. So with the rest of us. I do not think our country or any Church, meaning the whole united Church, is going to be built up by effacing the characteristics of its elements. In the British Empire are Irish, Scotch, English, and Welsh. I would not wish either of these to become like the other. The glory of the United Kingdom is in making each of those factors fulfill its mission. The difficulty of a united Church is going to be to give strength locally and strength centrally, and not put too much weight on the central structure, which will inevitably give rise to divisive counsels and to disintegrating forces.

J. H. Reynolds: I find myself in agreement with so many suggestions proposed that I will speak to only two or three. I believe we should have a General Conference of but one house, not two; perhaps derived from two sources, the Annual Conferences (with representation based on population) and Synodical, or Jurisdictional, Conferences (with representation based on corporate units). With the suggestion of a supreme court, I am in accord. I am not prepared to suggest the composition of that court; but it should pass final judgment not only on the acts of the General Conference, but on the acts of the Jurisdictional Conferences as well. There have been two suggestions as to the legislative power. One suggestion is that we federalize it—that is, divide it, turning part of it over to the General Conference and part over to the Jurisdictional, or Synodical, Conferences. The other suggestion is that we centralize or nationalize it—that is, centralize all legislative power in one body. With the suggestion that we should federalize it I am thoroughly in accord. Neither do I think that in doing that we will destroy the unity of the united Church. If we needed any example to enforce this thought, the United States government alone would furnish that

example. Are we not a nation? Are we any less a nation by reason of the fact that we are federalized? The arguments which were presented in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 for the Federal system are reënforced by the experience of one hundred and twenty-five years of American history. I fancy that these arguments are just as forcible as considerations that should govern us in seeking Church unity as they were in 1787 when we were trying to establish national unity. In the first place, if you center in the hands of one central legislative body the entire legislative power, you put an impossible burden upon it. The central legislature would stagger under the burden. You will put too much work there for it to do. The British Empire has long since deposited much legislative power with the respective units of the Empire. Our national Congress, notwithstanding its powers are delegated and large powers are left to State legislatures, finds itself heavily burdened with legislative duties. May I suggest further that the only way to secure thorough consideration by the General Conference of connectional matters is to lighten the burden on that body so that it may have to consider nothing but connectional legislation? Moreover, it will not be possible for the central legislature to consider local needs. This is a big country. There are wide differences between the East and the West, wider than between the North and the South. For the solutions of the local and special problems growing out of these differences there should be Jurisdictional Conferences clothed with adequate powers to deal with them. In addition, we will not mobilize all the moral and religious resources of our Church unless we give the largest autonomy for the full play of these powers and for the development of leadership competent in all local affairs. What has been the training school for American statesmen? The local State institutions. This training school has prepared them to figure on the national stage. In the distribution of powers between the local Synodical Conferences on the one hand and the General Conference on the other, we should make the General Conference one of delegated, not of residuary, powers and leave to the Synodical Conference residuary powers—that is, all powers not delegated to the General Conference nor prohibited to the Jurisdictional Conferences.

Edwin M. Randall: A careful study of the legislation of our Church in the matters that have gone before our General Conference has made it clear to my mind that there is but very little that has come before our General Conference of a legislative character that has not been too general and connectional to be given to local Regional Conferences. There is among us a fear that if the Regional Conferences be given legislative powers too extensive it will result in our becoming separated one from another in matters that are necessary to our unity. I cannot forget

that, whatever goes into the melting pot in the new Church, it is going to be my Church, please God. And I want the very best things in it that can be put into it. I desire a General Conference that will give us unity in all things where unity can be consistent with the efficiency of the Church in doing the best for our Master. In my judgment, the business of the Regional Conferences, whatever we call them, is not going to come so much from their taking over matters now attended to by our General Conferences as in their filling a field that is now unoccupied. In these recent times we have been building up educational and benevolent institutions of one sort and another and acquiring great property rights, and many matters of administration have pressed for settlement and attention that have not been attended to. We do need administrative Conferences with great discretionary power. I am in favor of giving them the very largest prerogatives in the way of local administration and whatever legislation may be of a strictly local nature. I do desire a General Conference that is strong in all that is connectional. I do not believe we are suffering much from lack of legislation. Many of us are even disposed to thank the Lord, when the General Conference is over, that many things proposed by those who were tinkering with our ecclesiastical machinery are left in the wastebasket. I think it is fully as well that they are. I want a bishop such that, wherever he is from, in any part of the Church, he is my bishop and a man who as bishop can come into any part of the Church as administrator and be absolutely at home. I should therefore like to see bishops elected by our General Conference. I believe it can be done with absolute safety under the rule prevailing in our Church which requires a two-thirds vote for the election of a bishop. We have never had in our Church a man so brilliant that, in any part of our Church, we were all agreed in our preference for him. Under a two-thirds rule it would be absolutely impossible to elect a man to the episcopacy over the opposition or dissatisfaction of any important section of our Church.

Bishop Hoss: Could not a man who can get one vote over one-third block an election?

Edwin M. Randall: Only in a very extraordinary situation. Perhaps, if only two were to be elected. But if any section of the Church were convinced it was not receiving proper consideration, it could block the election of any bishop. But I have no fear of any such emergency ever arising. We have been using your men in our General Conference, and we like them.

Claudius B. Spencer: I think it must be evident to everybody that the theory of a court would not have any serious opposition from the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church here represented. I think it is a safe statement that the thinkers of the Methodist Episcopal Church expect that some such arrange-

ment, some kind of a court, will be provided. One reason for this is that in this particular the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church is un-American. It is based, in fact, upon the same theory as the House of Parliament, which is the judge of its own legislation. This abstract theory as to our need of a court has suffered a number of jars in my mind when I have studied the manner in which the Methodist Episcopal Church has, after all, safeguarded the constitutionality of its acts. It has been to me a surprise that our Committee on Judiciary should overnight, as it were, render decisions which have stood the final test of the most acute minds. And yet, passing upon and rendering opinions as to the constitutionality of questions in the General Conference is a mere incident of the duties, it is one of the duties, of the overburdened Committee on Judiciary. Wishing to have a fairly American Church in that Church which is to be, I look with favor generally upon the attitude of the delegates of the Church, South, in this matter. And I repeat what I said a moment ago, I do not think that the general statement will find antagonism in the Methodist Episcopal Church. For that reason it seems to me that in large measure that is out of the way. As to the composition of that body, my own feeling is that it should not consist altogether of bishops, for reasons which have already been given. That there should be some bishops upon that court seems to me rational; but that those masters of law, laymen who understand the principles of judicial procedure, should be in that body to be most natural. The same is true in regard to the ministry. It seems to me there is a considerable unanimity here with regard to this question. So far as stopping General Conference legislation, I think that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has raised the question of what we call the "veto" only twice in all its history. So far as the Committee on Judiciary in our Church is concerned, there are but two instances where they have seemed to run contrary to constitutional foundations. So it seems to me that opposition to this question is based on a fear rather than a reality. I want to say two or three things on the composition of the General Conference. I thoroughly sympathize with the opinion of Dr. Moore that the General Conference should consist of one house. I believe that there is mentality enough in Methodism and in this Joint Commission to create the kind of a house that will absolutely safeguard the rights of a minority and that it is unnecessary to have the cumbersome two-house idea, which, as we meet once in four years, might prove a serious obstacle to securing legislation we wish to have. So far as protecting the rights of a minority is concerned, I believe that there is intelligence and fairness enough to safeguard the rights of all minorities and localities in framing the constitution for one house.

G. W. Brown: In the reorganized and unified Church I believe thoroughly in the principle of Regional Conferences. I think the Regional Conference stands in the same relation to the great unified Church, with its wonderful scope, as departmentalizing any great business. For greater efficiency of operation, all great businesses have to be departmentalized. If this great Church is going to serve the people in the most efficient way, it will need local cultivation in the sense that the Regional Conferences will provide. Therefore I think there is no question as to the wisdom of that plan. I believe that, so far as the General Conference is concerned, it should elect all bishops. I think the Regional Conferences should nominate. I think if the principle were so that these Regional Conferences would nominate probably double the number that they might reasonably expect to have elected as their quota, on the basis that all bishops were to be in general relation to the whole Church, their nomination could be recognized in the General Conference and therefore receive proper consideration. In regard to a supreme court, I believe fully in it. Why? Because this is a reorganized Church with regional or district sections. You might call it a "referee court" or "committee." I do not think it should be made up entirely of members of the General Conference. I think it should be made up of the judiciary in the Church. There should be men in the Church who have judicial experience, who should be named for each quadrennium, to be a court upon which the entire Church could safely depend on all occasions.

Thomas D. Samford: Almost all legislative progress of any great moment is the result of some form of compromise. There appears to be considerable objection to having the proposed General Conference composed of two houses or bodies. Such an arrangement, it seems, would make the supreme legislative machinery too cumbersome, and there would be an unnecessary consumption of time and consequent expenditure of money in the passage of possibly or probably ninety-nine per cent of the legislation enacted by such General Conference. Yet there also seems to be a consensus of opinion that there should be some arrangement by which the proposed Regional Conferences and the Church in the different proposed regions, and the right also of the minority in the Church should be fully and completely safeguarded and protected. It occurs to me that if there should be some provision for an equitable distribution of representation in the proposed General Conference, so that the different proposed regions, as such, and the clerical and lay representation in the General Conference all properly provided for, the safeguards and checks against hasty, ill-considered, and sometimes unjust legislation could be cared for by a provision lodged somewhere in the law that upon a call of, say, one-fifth of all the delegates

86 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

present a vote by orders and by regions can be demanded, and that no proposition shall become a law until it shall first receive a majority of each order *in each region* represented in the General Conference. Thus, by some such means, we might preserve all the safeguards and checks which may be desired and at the same time eliminate the objectionable features which will obviously attach to the dual form which has been proposed for the General Conference. I offer these remarks merely as suggestions for the consideration of the Commission.

E. B. Chappell: I believe we ought to have a constitution of the General Conference clearly defined. That has been said already, but perhaps not emphasized as it might be. I am confirmed in this conclusion by confusion that exists in our own Church as to what the constitution is. The constitution of the Church ought to be so clearly defined that there can be no doubt as to what it is. That would help us to come to some conclusions in regard to the authority of the General Conference. Now, there are many reasons why I think we ought to have a tribunal of some kind that is to pass on the constitutionality of the acts of the General Conference. You must remember, for one thing, besides all the other very excellent reasons already given this morning, that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, necessarily enters into this merger as a minority. We believe in our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church very thoroughly. We come here trusting you. We come with no thought that you mean in any way to take advantage of us. And yet you can see how very natural it is that, because we are to constitute a minority in the new organization, our people want to be quite sure that it will be impossible for anything to be done by a General Conference that would be in any way unjust to the minority. And you can see that, apart from other things said here this morning about the necessity for a judicial tribunal, the existence of such a feeling renders it necessary. I do not think that there is the danger that Dr. Randall seems to anticipate, of our drifting apart because of the large responsibilities that we are going to put upon our Quadrennial Conferences. The fact is, while I believe that we ought to have a strong General Conference, I am not so sure that I agree about the centralization of government in a great ecclesiastical organization. I believe there is an element of danger in too much centralization in a religious body as large as the Methodist Church will be when we are united. Of course we want a connectional General Conference and a vital relationship between the several Quadrennial Conferences. But it will be a matter, after all, much more of life than of legal bonds. The British Empire is one, as it is showing in a most remarkable way just now. And yet the very largest liberty of development is allowed to the various parts of

this great empire. The remarkable coherency they are showing in this awful emergency is due to the fact that they are bound together by life rather than by mere artificial bonds. They feel their destiny one. I believe that it will be that way in united Methodism and that we shall have a richer Methodism all around by allowing the very largest local autonomy to the several divisions, presumably to be composed of those who are closely related to one another and are developing a life that is in some respects peculiar.

C. M. Bishop: I apprehend that a good many of us are surprised at the direction the discussion has moved in this morning; for there has not developed any special line of cleavage with reference to the fundamental questions involved, as between a General Conference with unlimited powers and one with strictly limited powers. As far as I have been able to gather, all who have spoken accept without question the doctrine that somewhere there should be lodged the power to arrest unconstitutional procedure. We have really been discussing, for the most part, mere matters of detail in the final working out of the system of government by which the General Conference should be kept under constitutional supervision or should be constitutionally restricted; so that we have advanced a good deal, it seems to me, in that matter. We have almost gotten together on that matter. I cannot discern here any disposition to demand a General Conference with supreme legislative and administrative powers. So far I am greatly comforted, and I think we have made progress. As to the court which is to be established, or the tribunal to determine upon the constitutionality of measures, it seems to me that we are likely to be confused by the use of the term "supreme court"—unless, indeed, we adopt the explanation of it which Dr. Blake offered, which would actually constitute a *supreme* court with double functions—namely, the authority and power to pronounce upon the constitutionality of acts of the General Conference and, in addition, that which would make it an appellate court to which causes might be carried from lower courts. We have not taken into consideration this latter aspect of the supreme court, though it may become necessary as the constitution develops for us to have some tribunal of that sort. What we are agreed on is that we must have somewhere a power to determine the constitutionality of acts of the General Conference. The matters of detail can be worked out by the Committee. I stand with my brethren with reference to the power that should be left in the hands of the Jurisdictional Conferences, as large power as possible, particularly that which will make it practicable for the Church to adjust itself to local conditions and arouse local enthusiasms and use whatever power there may be in sectional feeling. I employ that phrase, of course, without refer-

88 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

ence to unkindness of sectional feeling, but we must use whatever power there may be in that to achieve results. I do not wish, so far as I am concerned, that Jurisdictional Conferences should be so completely separated from each other that we may not be able to bring the power of the whole Church to bear upon certain problems. I would not agree, for instance, that matters of Church extension should be left to Jurisdictional Conferences; for there may be wide sections in certain jurisdictions finally established which will need the help of other sections of the Church where church-building and the like has been carried forward successfully and completely. We must deliver the power and the wealth of the East to the West and to the South and to the remoter regions of the earth. And there must be somewhere that sort of interplay of life and intimate connection of part with part which will enable us to put the whole Methodist Church back of every local endeavor for the establishment of the kingdom of God. I wish to call attention also to this fact: Church government is very different from other government. It has a different purpose in view. It is based upon different considerations. We all know that in the historic discussions concerning the functions of government and those which have led finally to the development of democracies the purpose at the basis of government has been conceived as chiefly the protection and maintenance of those rights which are connected with property. Government has had that very largely in view in its laws and in its very constitution. But the constitution of the Church is for conquest, for evangelism. It is not for control, nor so much for protection of rights. It is in order to movement forward. I solemnly declare to you that I think this is the only justification of our episcopacy. It is not for government; it is for leadership.

A. F. Watkins: Upon the supposition that the basis of unification will provide for both Supreme and Regional General Conferences, it will be a matter of importance, but a matter of difficulty as well, to properly adjust the powers of these Conferences. It would be possible to give such emphasis to the authority of the Supreme General Conference as to destroy the autonomy of the smaller bodies. On the other hand, the powers given to the Regional Conferences might be so extensive and thorough-going as to create, not a united Church, but a federation. This may be avoided by having in view the *scope* of the authority of the several bodies rather than the *degree* of the powers of the one or the other. I have used the word "supreme" without hesitancy. It would be difficult to find a more suitable term. It means the highest Conference, the central Conference, if you please. Only a hypercritic would understand a *supreme* conference to mean an *absolute conference* when its powers are ex-

pressly hedged about by "constitutional limitations and restrictions." There are certain features of local autonomy, certain questions involving property rights, for instance, that must be left to the Regional Conferences, while all connectional powers must rest with the Supreme Conference. This makes for the necessity of a well-defined constitution. The rights of the minority must be protected. There is no more cruel tyranny upon earth than the tyranny of a majority. An individual tyrant has a conscience, though it may act feebly and be hard to reach. But a mob has no conscience. A majority may be ruthless. The time may come when the Southern section of our country shall have grown so in population that the Northeast will need protection from an aggressive majority in the Southwest. This protection must be found in a written constitution, the powers of which are superior to any General Conference, supreme or regional. The minority cannot rely upon any innate sense of justice of the majority. There might be (and I direct this thought to any who may be upon the committee to whom this matter will be referred) a provision inserted in the organic law of the Church by which the right is given to appeal to a vote of the regional elements of which the General Conference is constituted, no legislation being recognized as having been legally enacted unless favored by a majority of the members representing the sentiment of the country as a whole. Such an appeal is allowed in the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, under what is known as the right to call for a vote "by orders," and a similar right might well be inserted among the guarantees providing for the protection of the rights of the minority. Upon the other hand, the constitution might be made to guarantee the corporate integrity of the Church, thus securing definite unity, as against a loosely connected federation of regional Churches.

Bishop Denny : The very existence of some body authorized to make a settlement on a point that may be raised has in itself a settling effect. The very fact that we have in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, a body that can determine whether an action be constitutional or not has largely prevented the necessity for the frequent exercise of the responsibility laid on its bishops. There seems to be a general agreement that we should have some such body as that in any organization that may grow out of this Joint Commission. I believe there ought to be a body clothed with this power and responsibility. I should like to see it a little more effective than the one now existing in our Church. There has slipped by, now and then, an act clearly unconstitutional on questions determined after a few moments' consideration or with no discussion in the General Conference. Whatever provision may be made for any such body with determina-

tive power, it ought to be drawn with the least possible complications. You cannot expect from Methodist preachers and from the majority of laymen trained technical knowledge. When we have undertaken to demand that we have simply prepared to wreck the machinery. We have not enough men qualified to act as engineers of a complicated piece of machinery to make it an efficient piece of machinery. So I hope the Committee will bear in mind that whatever is presented here should be a very simple piece of machinery for work. It had better be simple and less effective than ideally more effective, but so complicated as not to be usable. I do not like the thought of a "court." I do not believe there ought to be in the Church anything that will carry with it the atmosphere that belongs to our State judicial proceedings. We have almost strangled our power to enforce discipline by the use of terms that are familiar in criminal procedure. The Methodist Church has never really had any prosecution of any one. It simply determines whether a man shall have a right to remain a member of the Methodist Church. The moment you talk about prosecution and all that, you shut up the way to just and efficient discipline. It is better to avoid the use of such terms as "court" and other terms carrying implications hard to avoid. We ought to have something somewhere. It makes little difference to me where it shall be lodged. We ought to have somebody selected to pass upon acts of this kind. I do not believe in unreserved power. If we had never had anything of that kind, I suspect we never would have had a division. It was the discussion and the attempt to determine what were the unreserved powers that led to our difficulty. I do not believe this central General Conference ought to have any other power than the power specifically granted to it. But grant it enough power to do the work that needs to be done. Lay it down with as great clearness as can be. Then I believe in the largest local autonomy possible. It would be a very great danger to take out of the hands of the Jurisdictional Conference the right to determine in the largest measure the matters that ought to be given to it. The more you can give to those Conferences for their determination, the better. I do not believe that the chief officers ought to be elected by the General Conference, nor that we should send up there double the number to be selected. There come times, brethren, when, after a man is placed in a responsible position, he could wish to be relieved of it. [Time expired.]

Bishop McDowell: I rise to make a motion at this point, not to extend the time, though possibly it may need to be extended, but for the purpose of making a motion, if there is unanimous consent to extend it. [No objection was raised.] In accordance with the agreement reached in the Committee on Organization and Procedure, I now move the creation of a Committee on the

General Conference and the provisions governing it, its powers and limitations.

J. F. Goucher: I hope the Bishop will not press that motion, because I think we had better hear the discussion concerning the Regional or Jurisdictional Conferences and anything else involved, and then possibly we may make a different distribution from the one outlined, constituting a very strong committee on the Conferences. It seems to me there is danger of overlapping.

Bishop McDowell: If there is to be the slightest objection, I withdraw the motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I congratulate you on the fine spirit that has been displayed in this exchange of views. You have had heat all the time, after the old Methodist fashion, but you have not been hot. You have had fourteen deliverances from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and thirteen from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

J. F. Goucher: The order, as I understand it, is that we appoint suitable committees after discussion.

Edgar Blake read the order:

2. We recommend the following subjects to be taken up in their order by the Joint Committee for general discussion, etc.

It would seem as though the fair construction of that would permit us to withhold the appointment of committees until all these matters have been discussed.

H. W. Rogers: In view of the discussion that has taken place, it must be perfectly evident to every one of us that there must be one committee to handle the powers of the General Conference and of the Quadrennial Conferences, and that we might very well separate the judicial questions from the legislative and have two committees, which might be authorized now, one to deal with the legislative powers of both General and Quadrennial Conferences and the other to deal with the powers of the Jurisdictional Conferences. I move that two such committees be constituted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Conference permitted an extension of time on the understanding that there would be no questions brought up that would introduce debate.

H. W. Rogers: If it would introduce debate, I withdraw it. I did not suppose it would.

The morning session closed at 12:38 P.M., with the doxology, and the benediction pronounced by Bishop Cranston.

AFTERNOON SESSION, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30

Bishop Cranston called the Commission to order at 2:37 P.M. The hymn "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing My Great Redeemer's Praise!" was sung.

Prayer was offered by J. M. Moore.

After singing of the hymn "My Faith Looks Up to Thee," R. E. Jones offered prayer.

The roll was called, with the following present: Bishops E. E. Hoss, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, I. E. Robinson, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr.

The minutes of the morning session were read by F. M. Thomas and approved.

Bishop Candler took the chair.

J. F. Goucher: The head of the gavel to be used to-day is made of the "Strawbridge oak," under which he had regular preaching appointments in 1764. The handle is a piece of olive wood from the Mount of Olives. The impulse of our entire Church has come from that center. The white oak tree of which this gavel is made was historic before the preaching of Strawbridge. In 1755, less than ten years before Strawbridge preached under that oak, a marauding band of Indians from Canada, allies of the French, swept down through the western part of Maryland. Their incursion was characterized by great cruelty and many massacres. One day five of these Indians came into what was afterwards known as the Strawbridge neighborhood. There they killed a man, burned his cabin, and took captive his wife and four children, one child a babe in arms and the oldest possibly eight. The Indians went on their way, destroying and killing until night came. After a heavy supper, when they all had lain down to sleep, the mother said to her children: "Don't go to sleep, but wait, and I will tell you what to do when the Indians are asleep." Soon the Indians were giving evidence of the soundness of their sleep. Then the mother said to the children: "Each of you take the tomahawk of the Indian nearest you, and when I say 'Now' each one break the skull of the Indian beside you. I will kill two, as baby can't kill any, and then we will run to the woods." They did as they were bid. The little one between four and five years of age could not hit quite hard enough, but stunned the Indian whom he struck. The family ran to the woods. Four of the Indians never awoke; but the Indian who had been stunned recovered himself and, reaching for his gun,

fired in the direction in which he heard the sound of cracking bushes. The bullet did not hit any one of the family, but buried itself in a tree, which thereafter was known as the "Indian tree." I heard this tradition in the neighborhood one hundred and fifty years afterwards. That tree in which the bullet lodged was the same tree under which Mr. Strawbridge preached the gospel when his congregation became too large for the house near by. A few years ago this "Strawbridge tree" was cut down, and the American Methodist Historical Society purchased it. In cutting the tree so that it could be handled, for it was seven feet in diameter, they came upon a bullet which had penetrated the tree two inches or less at the time it had been fired. The rings in the wood outside the bullet showed that the bullet was lodged in the tree about 1755, the time the tradition stated, and the bullet was a French one. That is the bullet in this gavel.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question before you is: "The Quadrennial Conferences: their number, boundaries, and powers."

Bishop McDowell: I do not want to speak, but evidently it will relieve the situation if somebody makes a small contribution and sets things going. The Committee on Organization and Procedure, I think, would say of this point, as was said of the other, that for the present we are in committee of the whole, without a motion before us; and that what we have in our mind is that the members of the Joint Commission shall speak freely as to the powers that may be given in the new Church to the Jurisdictional or Synodical or Quadrennial Conferences and what powers shall be withheld from those Conferences; what legislative functions, if any, shall be given to them, or whether they shall be limited to administrative activities; what elective powers shall be conferred upon them and what elective powers shall be denied to them; and what relation each of these shall sustain, or whether they shall sustain the same relation, no matter how made up, to the General Conference; the number of these Regional Conferences; the possible principles that should underlie the determination of the number and especially that should underlie the determination of the boundaries. Mr. Chairman, if you will not regard that I have spoken upon the subject in thus stating what I think the Committee on Organization and Procedure desire in this discussion in committee of the whole, I will make that statement so as to get the body started.

Bishop Cranston: Inasmuch as I was not permitted to participate in the deliverances of the morning, perhaps I would better get out of the way. I want to see a General Conference sufficiently strong to stand alone, if ever it were left to stand alone, in any crisis, under any emergency. Whether we will or not, we are world-wide Churches. Our Church is at work on every con-

tinent of the earth; and our sister Church is also engaged far, far from the shores of America as well as at home. Both have organizations in other continents than this. And we owe it to our people, if we care for them as we should do, to make provision for all of them in any government which we may constitute. It cannot possibly be in the mind of any member here to put away from us the children God has given us in Asia or Africa or South America or Europe. We have obligations which we cannot ignore. And there is nothing so fearsome about being a world-wide Church, after all. We have been praying God for children, and we have taken them under our care, and we have provided, so far as we have been able, for their education. These children have their various hues and colors. And it cannot be that we are so lacking in mother heart or father care as to be willing to turn these children of ours in China and Korea and India and elsewhere over to the care of such as might take them in keeping. Our work should go forward, and we should not by any means neglect it in any quarter of the world. I have the feeling that we ought to so organize our Jurisdictional or Regional Conferences that we might provide for recognition and representation of the Conferences on other continents. I was pleased with much said this morning about the matter of representation. The Regional Conferences furnish a unit of representation corresponding to State representation in the United States Senate. I have no doubt that that matter can be worked out satisfactorily.

J. F. Goucher: In my judgment, there are three things which should characterize the Regional or Jurisdictional Conferences. The first is, they should represent homogeneity of problems within their environment; for this is the distinctive purpose, as I understand it, that we may approach the scientific method by making it possible for a constituency that is reasonably homogeneous to legislate on its own problems. I think, in the second place, we should recognize, therefore, that in all probability there will have to be a Regional Conference for Eastern Asia; one for Southern Asia; one for Latin America; one for Africa and the Africans; one, possibly two, for Europe. That will depend upon how successfully the war may be settled. I take it that certain well-defined principles underlying and embodied in the Regional Conferences should differentiate them into two classes of Regional Conferences, both of them organically related to the General Conference, but their representation in the General Conference to be determined on the basis of their ecclesiastical development and necessities. A Regional Conference made up of a Church membership, with the traditions of generations of Christian activities, strong, self-maintaining, self-perpetuating, with the world vision, and engaged in carrying on the work of Methodism throughout the world, should be differentiated from those Con-

ferences which consist largely of missionary work and are depending upon missionary assistance. This being accepted as a working principle, the relation of the Regional Conferences to the General Conference should be a dual relation. These two relations exist and are well defined in the government of the United States. We have our great commonwealths, and we have our territories, each an integral part of the United States, but having different problems, responsibilities, and representation. So the Regional Conferences which are entirely self-supporting and aggressive, with Christian traditions behind them and with the passion and ability within them to carry on aggressively the world-wide work of the Church, being in a sense composed of those who have attained to the stature of men in Christ Jesus, should sustain a relation to the General Conference analogous to that of our States to the general government. And those Conferences which are practically missionary, struggling in an environment of entrenched opposition, immature, ecclesiastically provincial, should sustain a relation to the General Conference somewhat analogous to that of our territories to the general government of the United States. Third, I will say another thing in this connection; but, in my judgment (it may be a little outside this part of the discussion), these Regional Conferences should have the privilege of practically selecting their own bishops. These bishops should be fully recognized bishops anywhere and everywhere, but in their administration, the exercise of their episcopal function, should be confined to the regional area for which they were nominated, unless they are especially invited by bishops working in some other regional area to exercise their episcopal functions in that area, in which case they should be authorized to exercise in that other regional area their episcopal functions as requested. This is not a diocesan episcopacy. It is not a limitation of the episcopacy. In the Methodist Episcopal Church at the present time we have residential supervision. While there is no written law concerning it, it is in the *lex non scripta* that no bishop enters the regional area of another resident bishop to exercise his episcopal functions without the courtesy of a personal invitation. It would seem by extending this a little further— [Time expired.]

Bishop Hoss: This conception of a world Church is not merely unbiblical, but antibiblical. It consorts well with the genius of Romanism, but is distinctly hostile to the genius of Protestantism. In the second place, it is not a conception that can be worked out in practice. You know what has already come into Japan. Some of us were very regretful when they set up an independent Methodism in Japan. But after being on the ground, it is easy to see that it was the only thing that could have been done. We could not have saved Methodism under foreign su-

96 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

perversion in Japan. The same thing is coming in China, beyond a doubt. We have as healthy a mission in the Yangtse Valley as any other mission in the world. Bishops Lewis and Bashford have told me the same thing. You can get a congregation of twelve hundred in almost every place you come to. But race consciousness, which is just as dominating a thing on the other side of the Pacific as on this side, is beginning to assert itself. There is beginning to spring up in that China Mission the conception that they have the right to control themselves, to make their own legislation. And any attempt to control them through the processes of a General Conference that has its sitting a long way across the sea is an impossibility. I have had the same observation in Brazil and through South American countries. We have had a very fine mission in Brazil for the last thirty years. There is not a better mission in South America. We hold the whole of Portuguese South America in our two Conferences in Brazil. But there is springing up among them—and it is not easy to control—the feeling to which I have alluded. I had difficulty with it through four successive years in Brazil. They love the American Methodists. They will tell you they are attached to them. But there is the national feeling and the race feeling that they have the right to regulate their own matters and control their own destiny without interference from outside. The only thing that enables us to perpetuate our grasp upon them is that we furnish the funds. Otherwise they would go out overnight. You have that same thing up here in these countries. I take it that you have in other countries also. I do not want to give them up, of course. I do not intend to suppress a very fatherly feeling which I have toward them. But the greatest possible development has not occurred except in connection with liberty. Any attempt to impose the will of a world-wide Church that has the sitting of its General Conference always across the seas upon one of these foreign countries is an impossibility. I am not going to carry that to the full length. If I were going to do so, I would say that you are never going to get the best possible results out of the colored people in this country until they realize that they have control of their own affairs. I do not believe in any attempt to create a world-wide ecclesiasticism. It is an imitation of Romanism. It is not Biblical. It has no warrant in history. The very conception of it is not in the New Testament. We are going to have national Churches, whether we want them or not. The people are going to clamor for them and insist upon them and demand them. You might as well try to stop the operation of the law of gravitation as of this feeling inherent in the human heart. I must oppose an attempt to create a world-wide Methodism.

Bishop Cooke: I think that those who watch the current of

the river of affairs, rather than fasten their gaze wholly upon the wavelets which the wind may drive along the surface of the waters, will probably conclude this, that in the future there will be four, or possibly five, types of religion. I think the struggle in Europe plainly reveals it. There will be the Anglican type for the Anglican possessions. There will be the Roman Catholic type, largely modified by failures at the Vatican. There will be the Russian-Greek-Orthodox, extending itself, of course, over the whole Russian Empire and through the Slavonic races. It is evident to all men that the Churches representing these various nations, State Churches, have lamentably failed not only to arrest the slaughter of humanity, but to influence the minds of those nations out of which it was possible for such a struggle to come. The State Churches are evidently failures. Now, there is only one other type of religion left to spiritualize humanity, one other type alone, upon which emphasis should be placed for the spiritualizing of the State Churches. There is no use in any man indulging in idle imagining about destroying these Churches. Their roots are too deeply rooted in the past. When you attack the beliefs of a man who believes in them, you are attacking not his belief, but the impulse of a hundred generations behind him. The only religion that can by any possibility spiritualize those Churches is that type of religion which is emphasized in Methodism and nowhere else. Secondly, wherever Methodism has touched the people there has been a modifying influence upon the religious and social concepts of the people round about. It has been a leaven of the Holy Ghost for the régénération of those people. This it was in our German and Scandinavian and Italian missions. So that the idea of a universal Church does force itself upon us, not in an abnormal form, a deformed concept. We do not have to take the Roman form or think of that as the standard of a universal Church. The kingdom of God is a kingdom without frontiers. There is no such thing as a sectional Church in the New Testament. The primitive Church had no conception of a Church not equally at home in Carthage, in Athens, in Rome, in Marseilles, in Britain, or anywhere else. It had no conception of a national or sectional Church whatever. Tertullian himself declares: "The same faith is held in all the Churches." These peoples evangelized by us will either be with us or they will be our friends. It does not necessarily follow that we must govern them in a connectional sense because we give them a Regional Conference. They can have all the autonomy that they can expect or need under the Regional Conference. But they will have it, anyhow. All our central Conferences in Europe ought to be made General Conferences, in a certain sense.

F. M. Thomas: I had made up my mind not to say anything in this present discussion, but I am afraid that Judge Reeves

will not speak unless I do. I must begin by making an intellectual confession. I have been, in philosophical matters, a dualist. All my life I have been bothered by the baffling limitations of human existence. It has been difficult for me to find my way in the wilderness of the modern world. Like Dante, I have often found myself in a thicket. I therefore bring to your attention now the hopeless condition in which the modern world finds itself. Look at Europe. The Churches are unquestionably largely to blame for the conditions that have produced this world war. They have been supine while this political struggle was growing in intensity, dancing attendance on the State, instead of trying to lead it in the way of Christ to larger and nobler brotherhood. In 1879 the Evangelical Alliance met at Basle. The Churches of Christendom were represented there by their ablest men. They talked very beautifully about brotherly love, yet stressed the necessity of separate communions, touched icy ecclesiastical fingers, and went away, leaving Europe a smoking volcano. Turn to the intellectual world, and it is chaos. Any man who tries to keep track of the currents of present-day thought knows this to be true. Pluralism, which in the last analysis is a falling apart of the universe, is advocated by many leading thinkers. In America the social problem is commencing to loom dark and serious. During the recent threatened strike I happened to be at the headquarters of a great railway system and found them piled with ammunition boxes. The supreme question that confronts me as a minister and as a man is: Is there any reconciling power anywhere? I believe that in our pulpits to-day there are many men who are pessimists at heart, almost hopeless in the face of the terrible contradictions of human life. How shall we orient our Churches to that reconciling power that Jesus Christ claimed for his gospel? That gospel tells me that he shall redeem all things, that all things shall be headed up in him. Brethren, I believe this. I once heard that seer and saint, Bishop Alpheus Wilson, declare that the physical order is awaiting the redemption of man. And the redemption of mankind in a very true and large sense waits on the redemption of the Church from the sins of competition and unbrotherly schism. Brethren, I am not afraid of a world-wide ecclesiasticism any more than I am afraid of a federation of nations which must follow this war. Seeing as I do everywhere the sign of Satan, the clash of nations, the sin and sensuality of even the rich in our great cities, I can pray for some organization that can represent throughout this whole world the redemptive power of Jesus Christ. It may not be given unto American Methodism to attain unto this; but I do most earnestly believe that God is some day going to breathe upon some people the breath of the risen Christ and that this people shall in some large and luminous way incarnate to dying

men the sublime message that John Wesley voiced: "The world is my parish."

A. W. Harris: If I understand what the Bishop means by a world Church, I do not believe in such a Church. I would resent the government of my Church from a foreign country. And I think that feeling a very common one. Unless Methodism can relieve itself of the element of foreign government, it never can do its best work, to the fullest extent, in other lands than our own. But in another sense I do believe in a world-wide Church. A Church may render to the whole world a worthy service. To become such a Church we must find means of giving every nationality the chance to govern itself in local affairs and means of bringing brothers, the world around, to know each other. One of the most unfortunate results of the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this country is that we of the North have not yet known you of the South and that you of the South have not known us of the North. Had we known each other, I doubt not our division had been healed many years ago. In these days when we are longing for world peace and dreaming of leagues to insure peace we do the world a great service if in the name of the Prince of Peace we can bring the peoples of the lands to know each other through the common worship of one common Lord. And in this plan of reorganization I see a chance to unite the peoples of Asia and Africa and Europe and America in common devotion to the one Master through a common organization, not tyrannical but fraternal, which shall enable the peoples to join hands over the span of oceans and over what is still more difficult and divisive—ignorance, prejudice, and dislike.

John M. Moore: We are face to face with facts, and we have to make our plans to meet these facts. We may have some theories of a world Church. We may have some objections to a world Church. But the fact is, we have a world Church. Methodism has it. We have our membership in Europe and Asia and Africa and South America as well as in our own continent. The question before us is this: In view of the fact that we are building what we call a jurisdictional system, what will we do with these peoples who live beyond the seas? We are going to have Synodical Conferences in the United States. Are we going to attach these peoples in these various Conferences to the Synodical Conferences in the United States, or will we make them into Synodical Conferences of what we might call a missionary order? I do not mean to say they will be a less order, but I mean of an order that will fit them to the conditions in which they labor. I think it would be very well indeed to have some such divisions as were suggested by Dr. Goucher. I do not see how else we are going to take care of the people who are now Methodists, living in those countries, except through the estab-

lishment of Synodical Conferences that will touch that territory in the best way possible. The question comes here: How many Synodical Conferences should we have in the United States? I think Dr. Goucher has laid down a very fine principle when he said that the environment should be congenial. We should establish the lines according to history and common sense. We have great rivers running through this country that divide up our territory. We have west of the Mississippi River 1,600,000 white members. We have east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio River, running directly east from the Ohio River along the border of the Virginia and Baltimore Conferences, 1,600,000 members. We have in the northwestern portion of the country, above that river and west of the boundary line of Pennsylvania, 1,200,000 members and more. In the five Central States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio we have 1,200,000 members or more. This gives some ground upon which to work if we take the membership in America. I would desire that these Synodical Conferences should be made up with an eye to the membership in each of them, making them as nearly equal as we can, observing these natural lines and congenial environments. West of the Mississippi you have a great territory with 1,600,000 that could be very easily divided equally geographically, and you would divide the membership about equally and at the same time maintain a certain sort of congeniality. That would give you five Synodical Conferences. I do not know whether we would work out so many as that or not, but it seems to me that some such natural indications are before us. Now, as to powers. I would have the Synodical Conferences elect the bishops and all the connectional officers that are to work in that Synodical Conference. [Time expired.]

Bishop Mouzon: I may not add anything to what has been already said, but I will at least give my testimony. I do not care to have anything to say about a world Church. That is a long way off as yet. What I am interested in just now is the possible unification of American Methodism. The unity of the whole Church of God is a splendid ideal. The unity of humanity waits upon the unity of the Church of God. The world was never more divided than to-day. Never was there more hate and bitterness than to-day. The largest possible contribution that could now be made to the unity of the Church of God would be the unification of American Methodism. Therefore I believe the largest possible contribution to the unity of the race just now would be the unification of American Methodism. We are moving along right lines. But we have now come to points of difficulty. What shall be the powers of the General Conference? And what the powers of the Jurisdictional Conferences? Personally, if we are unified at all, I want us to be unified all the

way through, as far as may be. I do not dream of a federation of little Churches. I dream of one Church. So far as can be recalled just now, the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had committees about as follows: Episcopacy, Itinerancy, Revisals, Boundaries, Sunday Schools, Church Extension, Church Relations, Missions, Education, Publishing Interests, and some others that cannot now be recalled. When we began to ask, "What power shall we give to the Jurisdictional Conferences? and what to the General Conference?" we began to see difficulties. The episcopacy—take that. Itinerancy—think of that. Revisals—I am just throwing out suggestions here. Certainly I would have the bishops to be named by the Jurisdictional Conferences and confirmed by the General Conference and ordained at the General Conference. I am in full sympathy with Dr. Goucher in what he said so well a moment ago. Now, as to the question of boundaries, Conference boundaries would certainly be determined by jurisdictions, and jurisdictional boundaries would be determined by the General Conference. As to the Jurisdictional Conferences, I am not naïve enough to suggest that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, remain intact just as it now is and that the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church divide their territory into jurisdictions. That is both impossible and unreasonable. It had never entered my mind until a certain gentleman remarked that it was evidently the intention of the General Conference at Oklahoma City that the boundaries as determined in 1845 should remain for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I do not wish it so, speaking for myself. But I do desire that those regions that are similar, that have similar interests, should be grouped together, so that all interests of the Church might be looked after the better. But we shall be puzzled over the proper division of powers. [Time expired.]

A. J. Nast: I hesitate to rise. I cannot contribute anything to your wisdom. I simply wish to call attention to one aspect of the question of Regional Conferences. First, I fully agree with what has been said in regard to the necessity of grouping our work in foreign lands into more or less autonomous Regional Conferences. Members of our Church in these various foreign countries ought to have the widest possible autonomy in governing their local affairs and a large amount of liberty in adapting themselves to national and social customs while at the same time preserving fully the genius and spirit of Methodism. They must remain in the most intimate touch with the mother Church in this country. They themselves feel most deeply the inspiration of this inner bond of fellowship, and we certainly should not wish to cut asunder that bond or weaken it in any way. It is essential to their best development inwardly and outwardly. But they

should not be hampered by a too strict application of disciplinary provisions which have grown out of conditions that do not obtain abroad. In the next place, I desire to speak of the principles which should govern the formation of Regional Conferences in this country. They cannot be formed wholly on the basis of territorial boundaries. There are other elements of an internal nature to be considered, such as a natural homogeneity growing out of a special providential mission. I refer to our mission work among the foreign populations of this country and particularly to our German work. This work was providentially begun in America by the Methodist Episcopal Church before the division in 1844. Our Church was the first American evangelical Church to inaugurate the principle of reaching our foreign populations with gospel preaching in their own tongue, and this principle has been vindicated by the most marvelous success under the blessing of God. The fruits of our German Methodist work extend across the sea to Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, where it numbers three Annual Conferences and one Mission Conference, with nearly 300 ministers and about 35,000 members. In this country our German work embraces ten Annual Conferences, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Duluth to Texas, with about 600 ministers and 65,000 members. The Church, South, has also a German Mission Conference in the great State of Texas. What are you going to do in the united Church with this large and by far the most successful and vigorous domestic missionary work of Methodism in the United States, which for a number of years has constituted one of the fifteen General Conference Districts of the Methodist Episcopal Church? Obviously, Regional Conferences based on merely territorial lines of division will not conduce to the conservation and efficient prosecution of this great branch of missionary work in the United States, but, on the contrary, would have a strong tendency toward its disintegration.

Bishop Murrah: There are just one or two things I should like to mention here. I am not going to assume to offer any substantial contribution to this discussion, but I desire to indicate a few things about which I should like to be enlightened. The phase of the question we have this afternoon is much more interesting to me than the phase we discussed this morning. I never did believe there would be any serious difference between us as regards the General Conference. I do not think there is any disposition in one Church or the other to oppress or secure any undue advantage. I do not think there is any spirit of that kind. As far as the people where I live are concerned, they do not suspect anything of the kind. I have always believed that the general consensus of opinion would favor the idea that the General Conference should be under proper restrictions and lim-

itations. But when it comes to this matter of Jurisdictional Conferences we strike something that brings up difficulties which I do not care to magnify. I am sure I am not minifying them. But they are so serious to me that they make me pause. I was very deeply impressed this morning with the suggestion made by Bishop Hamilton, a sentiment with which I am in most hearty accord, that we ought to keep things very much as they are. I like Methodism very much as it is. I did not come here with the idea that we require any very great change to adjust ourselves to conditions. I believe that as a modern Church we are prepared, so far as our economy and doctrines are concerned, to meet modern conditions. Personally I do not care for anything except that we should have one name and administer our foreign missionary affairs as one Church. But I suppose, if we are just to have one name, there will necessarily be this question of Jurisdictional Conferences. And that is a thing that will have to be considered. The point that I am especially concerned about is this: How are we to determine these Jurisdictional Conferences, their number, and their boundaries? Are we to come into this reorganized Church and then have a joint General Conference to determine it, or determine it before we come into the reorganized Church? I would like to be enlightened on that subject, and I trust the speakers who may have some definite views on that subject will address themselves to it, because, unless we can under these Jurisdictional Conferences have proper respect to the sentiments of different parts of the country, all our efforts will be in vain.

H. M. Du Bose: I am not proposing to answer the tremendous question asked by Bishop Murrah; but I have felt impressed by the fact that in the beginning of this discussion we went to the remote, rather than the nearer, difficulties of the situation. It is to determine, first of all, what we are to do with our home territory that we are here, how we are to settle our home conditions. Then it will be easier, if not easy, to determine what we are to do with those outlying missionary fields to which we are related. My thought and hope have been that in this readjustment we are to settle, once for all, difficulties which have vexed us these seventy and more years. There is an ominous word, constantly growing more ominous in our categories, "the border." There our difficulties have been centered all the time, and there they are becoming accentuated. It was to meet these difficulties and satisfy the conflicting interests represented on the border that all this movement for federation was put forward and has been brought to its present happy, promising prospect. So I think we should consider earnestly, and first of all, what we are to do with our home territory. We have the fairest spot of all God's continents and the fairest parallels in

this most wondrous continent, stretching from ocean to ocean, and between the Lakes of the north and the Gulf. We have the fairest and most fruitful country not only on this continent, but in all the lands. It is that land where gospel and history and prophecy indicate the center of God's kingdom is to be fixed. From it are to go out influences that are to evangelize and bless the world. But to have this kingdom we must first settle our own difficulties. It is to settle these border difficulties that we are here, and so our instructions are defined. Certainly we of the South would not ask our brethren to divide their territory and not be willing to divide ours. Four sectors, then, are the very least that have been in my mind at all. I have not studied the grouping of our membership, but such study would indicate where these lines should be drawn. They should be drawn with a view of forever removing our difficulties and sweetening those bitternesses that have grown up on the border. As to the work in missionary lands, it seems to me that it would come very largely under the administration of a great connectional missionary board that would emerge in the new Church. Let us continue to regard all our fields as we now regard them, and their settlement into national Churches or unit sectors would be matters of detail for our Missionary Boards. As to the powers of the Jurisdictional Conferences, I have no thought, except as to what powers might be necessary to make this administration effective. Certainly, if we reserve to the General Conference the great questions of ministerial character, of rights of members, and matters of constitution and the interpretation thereof, the direction of our larger educational and missionary enterprises and Church extension, I am perfectly willing, in imitation of the nation's relations to the States, to leave as a connectional residuum the balance of power to the jurisdictional bodies.

A. F. Watkins: In the matter of the Regional Conferences there is one thing that we should do, and, having done this, we can very well afford to leave to the future other questions that may arise in connection with them. We should, it seems to me, definitely decide upon the desirability of these Conferences as a part of the organization of the reorganized and unified Church. The plan of these autonomous Conferences and the principle upon which provision should be made for them the paper of Dr. Goucher has admirably set forth. They should be sufficient in number to meet the necessities of the Church at the present time and in the near future. Upon the other hand, they should be sufficiently large to be respectable in membership and area and to guard against disturbing the integrity of the Church. We might go so far as to indicate in general the relation of these bodies to the supreme General Conference and in a general way to outline their duties and privileges. Having done this, we may

safely leave to a future meeting of this Commission the question of their number and the more detailed plan of their authority and the relation in which they are to stand to the principal legislative body of the Church. At some later meeting there might well be considered the question of the possibility or the desirability, or even the necessity, of making the relation of the Regional Conferences to the supreme General Conference to depend upon local conditions, such as those of racial advancement and self-support.

Bishop McDowell: I do not wish to seem to offer any correction, but must make a correction of a statement made by Dr. Goucher as to the present methods of administration of the episcopacy in the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is true no bishop now or ever is in the habit or was in the habit of going into the area or region of another bishop in disregard of episcopal propriety. But equally no bishop now depends upon the invitation of another area to go over into that area for episcopal purposes. The Board of Bishops has the power, and exercises it constantly, to assign any bishop in the Board to episcopal jurisdiction in any area, and it constantly sends bishops across all these boundaries in the exercise of its undisputed right. The matter of waiting for an invitation is utterly unheard of among us. Now, Mr. Chairman, having said that, just by way of correction, in order that a mistaken idea might not be lodged in your minds, let me remind you, first of all, again, that our great task is the task of unification of the Church. Reorganization is the method. But it is possible for us to make a reorganized Church which shall not be a unified Church, and that is the crux of this particular point to which we have now come. We can make a series of Jurisdictional Conferences which might prodigiously minister to local efficiency, which might greatly satisfy local sentiment and the desire for local autonomy. We can do that in such fashion as absolutely to destroy denominational unity and integrity. We can do it in such fashion as to cut the strong off from the weak, the weak from the strong. We can do it in such fashion. Heaven save us from doing it in such fashion as to lend our Church's support and countenance to that very thing that is breaking the heart of the world to-day—race assertion, race prejudice, exaggerated national emphasis that does not look toward humanity, but looks toward the other thing. Now, brothers, I am not anxious for a union that is simply going to make a new barrier between Minnesota and Virginia. The only reason why I want us to get together is that I desire that we shall come together and be together. And the whole problem in the Jurisdictional Conference is not the problem even of efficiency and its local autonomy. The great problem is the problem of how far we can so adjust as to secure unity, for we have common problems.

We no longer stand in one corner and leave the other corners unoccupied. The immigrant problem which was ours a little while ago is now yours also and is becoming increasingly yours. The negro problem, of which I may speak with perfect frankness, was yours at close range and ours at longer range, but is increasingly ours at close range as well as yours. And it is a common problem. In facing this question of Jurisdictional Conferences we have to have regard, not simply for local autonomy, not simply for the following of natural lines locally defined. We have to have regard for that unity of coöperation and self-consciousness that will enable us to throw the whole weight of our Church wherever Christ's kingdom demands it.

Edwin M. Randall: Dr. Bishop's admirable address this morning expressed better than I could much that has been dwelling in my mind for some time. Brethren, I feel that we should have these two principles before us in what we were discussing this morning and in what we discuss this afternoon. In the first place, through our General Conference and our general connectional plan, we wish to be in a position that will enable us to mobilize with the greatest possible success the entire resources of our Church for application wherever we have a problem or a difficulty or wherever needed in the evangelization of the world. And the unity that we must have must not only be legal, but it must be spiritual. Then, in the matter we are discussing this afternoon, that of these Regional Conferences, we need to provide that local administration of these resources, that local application of them that will enable us as a Church, with the immense resources that God has placed in our hands and that are so rapidly growing greater, to apply these resources and the great power of our Church with the greatest possible success. I believe everything ought to be planned with these considerations in view. I think that defines pretty well the position that I take in that matter. So far as these Regional Conferences are concerned, I have no thought or feeling in regard to them, except as that principle may work out. As Brother Brown stated this morning, the divisions that may come in the work of the Church are like the departments of a great coöperative business. It is possible to make your departments so large that they will not be administered efficiently. I fear that if the divisions are to be legislative the very recognition of them may stand in the way of their efficiency. I fear in regard to the functions we may give them. You cannot give them a larger local administrative autonomy than will be acceptable to me. I believe they ought to select the editors of their official organs and their representatives on the great boards of the Church. Various other things I would give to them. I fear, however, for their election of bishops. Our Episcopal Board is one of the most important bonds of unity

among us, perhaps the most important. An Episcopal Board which we feel belongs to all of us and administers to the whole territory—that is my ideal in regard to that. In regard to our foreign field, I think if we create some of these foreign fields into such districts, as I believe we must, they must be given a higher and broader autonomy than we give these fields at home. We are similar throughout this land in all respects. But in these foreign lands they are obliged to vary greatly from our practice at home, especially in regard to the young people's work and those activities that have to do with women. There are some parts of our Discipline that do not apply there, as that relating to our Freedman's Aid Society. There are some other parts of our Discipline that cannot apply there. We must meet those conditions to take care of what we already have on our hands. But on our home fields I believe we should have a larger number of Regional Conferences than has been contemplated. But, however large the number may be, or whatever their functions may be, or whatever the functions of the General Conference may be, I desire in the depths of my soul that we may have such a unity that the heart of our whole Church will be one in sympathy and in the pouring of our resources into the common work of our Church throughout our land and the whole world, so that no one shall in his soul have any thought or feeling or prejudice to prevent his putting all his resources at the command of the Church, that it may be locally and generally most efficient.

J. W. Van Cleve: There are two things in this discussion against which we need constantly to guard. I am not sure that we are always doing it. One of them is the danger of immediacy, of trying to find something that will meet the present situation without considering fairly how it will work out in the future. The other danger is very closely akin to it. The other danger that we have is the danger of taking too narrow a view of the things we are dealing with, of being too limited locally. That thought has come to my mind in considering the fact that if we are to have Regional Conferences we have two distinct problems that we shall be obliged to solve in them. I think nobody fancies that we shall be able to hold permanently to the Methodist Episcopal Church in America our constituencies in the lands across the sea. There may be a day when the spirit of division that makes national Churches will give way in Protestantism to such a spirit of reunion as will bring us to a real world Church. To my mind, this is the only solution of the problem of peace of the world. I do not believe that any one of the national Churches can be a finality for the kingdom of God. I think it is a fair question to be raised here as to whether it is really necessary or why it should be necessary to have any Jurisdictional Conferences at all. One of the things we are inclined to forget is that we are

not legislating for two ecclesiasticisms even of the Methodist type. We are not legislating for this reformed Methodism only—we shall remember that, if we take the right view—but for the kingdom of God here upon earth. There is not a Church in Christendom, and particularly in America, that has not tremendous interest in what we are doing and will not be tremendously impressed one way or the other. But more important, there is a vast body of most intelligent men that are anxiously wondering whether there is enough cohesive power in Christianity to bring Christians together and are feeling that the happy solution of these problems lies in just that cohesive force in Christianity. And if we do not bring about a union of the Methodist Episcopal Churches, some of the best and most spiritual men in this country outside the Churches will be deeply disappointed, and the whole work of Jesus Christ in this commonwealth will receive a jar that will be hard to recover from. There is a tremendous responsibility upon us at this point. Many of these men who are watching us are far too acute and reflective to be deceived for a moment with a unity which simply whitewashes over the cracks. So I have the feeling that, if we are to have any Regional Conferences at all, without particular reference to number or to boundaries, one of the governing principles guiding us in the arrangement of these Regional Conferences should be so to arrange them as to promote the utmost sympathy and interchange among us. One of the things which led to separation was that all the tides of life were running east and west and not north and south. We do not know one another's problems well enough.

C. B. Spencer: I have a book here that I purchased during the noon hour, "Religion in Europe and the World Crisis." It is a book on religion not only in Europe, but throughout the world, as related to the European war. The titles of the chapters are worth the \$2.50 I paid for it. It brings to my mind with the greatest force that, whether we will or not, the Methodist Episcopal Church is in a sense a world force. For that matter, I am anxious that it should be so, because we have a connectional system that makes it possible for us to handle and mobilize the Protestant sentiment of the planet more than any other single Protestant force. I do not overestimate that. I have hoped that as the years go on and the centuries move on toward the latest time there might be an evangelical body like ours, managed by as great intellect as the race can have, to mobilize and direct these Protestant forces as distinguished from the forces which emanate from the Tiber. That is essential, especially in considering various remarks that have been made. As to the number of Jurisdictional or Regional Conferences, coming straight to the point, I believe that the Methodist Epis-

copal Church has a positive need of these Jurisdictional Conferences. We had a definite illustration in the city of Boston when the general committees were meeting in that neighborhood. There were gathered the representatives of the episcopal area. The ablest speakers of the denomination were there. It came to me then that if some resolutions passed there had been in the nature of legislation the area might have received the power that belongs to legislation. I wish we could have not only four, but almost a multiple of four. There are regional areas which have homogeneous problems, and the New South will more and more have heterogeneous problems. If we could so organize the new Church, it seems to me the Regional Conferences might be coöordinated with the general organization in such a manner as to make a very real local force rather than a makeshift to meet certain minority difficulties. I believe that the Jurisdictional Conferences or Regional Conferences or Synodical Conferences—whatever they will ultimately be called—are a prime necessity at the present moment in universal Methodism, whether organic union is effected or not. I wish that they could be so multiplied that we would put into them the real federal ideal, not two or three divisions of this American land, but as many as have homogeneous relations, as, for example, such units as we have in the jurisdictional areas of our bishops, where there could be real solidarity, real legislation, real team work, and the impulse coming from this coöordination such as would be impossible if we have only one Jurisdictional Conference in all the South or two in all the great, vast West.

A. J. Lamar: One or two things, I think, we ought to keep in mind. One is that by instruction, certainly by the action of both General Conferences, we are committed to working out a plan of Jurisdictional Conferences. Both Conferences have approved that, the bodies that appointed this Commission. They left the number indefinite. But to the principle of Jurisdictional Conferences we are shut up. I think that the nearer we can come to working out a complete plan of unification by reorganization to report to our next General Conferences, the better we shall satisfy those General Conferences and the more quickly will we lead to the consummation of the work of unification. We may so report first to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. If they are pleased with our report and will adopt it, they adopt it. If we can get up such a report as will be pleasing to the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church and they accept it, they adopt it. If we present a report which leaves important matters for the General Conferences themselves to decide, they will have handed it about from one General Conference to another through a series of years, and we may be delayed year after year in accomplishing the object for which we were created. I

think, therefore, that, however difficult it may be, we ought to concentrate upon one problem at a time until we have considered all of them and present in our report to our General Conferences a well-articulated scheme for the whole constitution and government of the Church that is to be.

Bishop Hamilton: I did not intend to say anything further; but I had in mind this morning, as I have very clearly now, a straightforward, outspoken policy that is simply supplementary to what I stated this morning. Unification is the first thing. We need you, and you need us. Conditions are such in the country, of sin, of national issues, that you ought to be North helping us as we have been South trying to help you if in nothing else than the schools we have instituted down there among all the people. I am not afraid of anything at all that we bring up here. We must be candid, but Christian. I want the two Churches to come together just as we are here. When Wesley said, "The world is my parish," he thought only of the spiritual realm. I am afraid, brothers, if we go much into details, that we will legislate beyond the providence of God. Whenever there comes an opportunity, such as had to come (I am willing to admit, against my will, judgment, and inclination), for Japan to withdraw from us, I conceded it. When it comes, as it is not likely to come, from China and India or any of the rest of the world, let it come to be considered then. The Methodism that has been a providential movement in following the leadings of Almighty God will be able to handle the future. Concerning Regional Conferences, I am bound to say that we have two Jurisdictional Conferences now, one for yourselves and another for ourselves. In beginning the union let your Church elect your share of the bishops and General Conference officers and ours do the same thing; but have one great common jurisdiction in our minds that when we come to be sitting down in council together it shall be to follow the leadings of Almighty God, who is "able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think," and especially in these things as they come up. For my life I cannot at this time sit down and fix up for any part of this country some sectional jurisdictional territories that I think would suit the respective peoples that are there. If we all get together, those jurisdictional matters, when they would come up, would take care of themselves. But if you undertake to form four or six or ten Regional Conferences, you must remember the plan has to go back to the two Churches for acceptance. Why do we want legislation beyond where we now are? Let us get together in the spirit of unification and try to lay out what we need now. You cannot fix up all the Germans or the Italians in a geographical way. In the North we have these problems more than you do. We have had vast matters in hand. Are you going to sit down and legis-

late for what is to come in the years ahead of us? Let us, I repeat, follow the providence of God and legislate for what and where we are. We in America owe the world great gifts and great service. We are under solemn obligation to do what we need to do and united can do. We are not ready to cut the nerve of missions by separating any part of our territory until itself wants to be separated. Fraternity and federation are in the air. Distance no longer disturbs fellowship. The whole world is looking to us for the settlement of European questions. Let us get ready for the world's problem when it comes. But let us not go to legislating for the whole world now, but start where we are at this hour.

It was voted at 4:20 that a recess of five minutes be taken.

At the close of the recess Bishop Denny, for the Committee on Organization and Order of Procedure, reported that the following program had been arranged for the service at the grave of Bishop Asbury on Sunday:

Hymn.

Prayer by Bishop Mouzon.

Address by Bishop Leete.

Hymn.

Benediction.

The order of the day was taken up and discussed, as follows:

J. H. Reynolds: I rise to address myself to one thought only. There developed in the early stage of the discussion this afternoon rather sharp difference of opinion as to whether or not the proposed Church should be a world Church or a national Church. On the one hand it is insisted with emphasis that race consciousness, national consciousness is such a decisive, history-making fact that it offers an insuperable barrier in the way of a world Church. On the other hand it is insisted that the basic conception of Christianity—that of a universal, world-conquering religion—has implicit in it a world Church, and missionary operations make explicit this conception. There seems to be a real difference between members of our commission on this question. For the consideration of those entertaining divergent views on the question I submit the following reflection: Are we at this stage of history prepared to prejudge the question? Have we enough information to pass finally upon it? National consciousness, such a dominant force now, such a history-making power for the last century, is largely responsible for the present world war. The peoples of the world have been organizing for the last century more and more along the lines of national consciousness. But international commerce, rapid means of communication and travel, and other agencies for decades past have been powerful factors developing a world life—that is, a body of ideals and principles common to all mankind—and the close student of human affairs for the last decade cannot fail to dis-

cern tendencies and conscious efforts among the nations to develop some kind of international governmental machinery as a channel through which this world opinion and world life may find expression and may exert power in world relations. The recent proposal of a league of the nations to enforce peace is one of these efforts. Are we sure that they will not succeed? Certainly history shows that this world life cannot function permanently through an imperial world state based on force. But are we so sure that democracy may not evolve a working form of the world state based on large national autonomy and liberty? Likewise, with respect to the proposed Church, is it not possible to develop in the people called Methodists, the several nations and races with whom the Church works, a body of spiritual ideals common to all Methodists, of whatever nation or race? Moreover, is it not possible for the general Church through autonomous jurisdictions to give full recognition to national consciousness and at the same time through connectional channels to afford an opportunity for the common life of Methodism to flow freely to all parts of the Church in all lands? Some of us indulge the hope that this will prove to be true. But perhaps we do not have sufficient facts to prejudge the question. But, what is more to the point for the purposes of this Commission, it is not necessary for us to prejudge the question whether we can or cannot have a world Church. We merely need to formulate a plan of Church government designed primarily to serve the needs of American Methodism with flexible machinery for foreign missionary operations, leaving to Providence to determine the final form that the Church shall take.

T. N. Ivey: For several months I have been trying to write to some extent on this question. I cannot say that I have reached that point where I feel that I know very much about the question. Consequently I have been listening with very deep interest to everything that has been said during the morning and afternoon sessions. While I have been enjoying the thoughts of these speakers this afternoon and have received from them considerable instruction, at the same time it seems to me that in the main they have simply been traveling around on the periphery of this question, "Quadrennial Conferences: their powers, their boundaries, their number." Of course the first point was discussed at length this morning, and there is no great need this afternoon for any further discussion of it. As to the boundaries of the Quadrennial Conferences, I would say that it has been impossible for many of us at least to say much on that point simply because we have not determined the number. It is necessary to say something about the number of those Conferences before we say anything about boundaries. I have heard very few suggestions this afternoon as to the number. Of course that point has been

touched now and then. It is a very delicate point. It is no wonder that we have had so little to say as to boundaries. I presume that some of you who have not spoken intend to speak before the discussion of the question closes. If you were to ask me to be consistent and to state my views. I could do so, but only in a very general way. As to the number of our Quadrennial Conferences, the more I consider the question, the more I am confident that, speaking for America alone, it would simply be impossible for us to effect the great purpose for which we stand with fewer than four or five of these Quadrennial Conferences. I can see how we can hedge the powers and resources of our great Church by too small a number of Conferences. I can see how we can dissipate those resources by too great a number of these Conferences. I should feel indebted to the brethren if they would address themselves to that point and then say something as to boundaries this afternoon.

Edgar Blake: I do not know that I have very much that will illumine the minds of the members of this Commission; and yet perhaps I may relieve my own, and that will satisfy me in a measure. In regard to this matter of a world Church I am not at this particular moment quite so much interested in that subject as I am in the consideration of the subject of bringing the two Episcopal Methodisms in the United States together, if that be possible, although I would suggest for the consideration of the brethren who have some hesitation in looking this question of a world-wide Church fairly in the face that the trend of modern thinking appears to be in the direction of a new internationalism which is to bind the nations of the world together. The Church cannot follow very far in the rear of that movement. However, the thing that concerns me most is our immediate problem at home. Dr. Goucher has stated for me most admirably the principles that underlie any scheme of reorganization that we are likely to consider. As I understand it, both General Conferences have committed themselves to the principle of the Jurisdictional Conferences. The one difference that has developed is as to the numbers. Now, as to the powers of the Jurisdictional Conferences, I think we have come to this, that to Jurisdictional Conferences shall be committed full legislative authority over all their local affairs. So far as I am concerned, I have come distinctly to that proposition. Everything that will permit a given region to work more effectively in the interests of the kingdom of God, I want that particular thing committed to the Regional Conference. I think we all desire unity and genuine unity. For that reason I think we ought to consider, in determining the principles of the bounds of these Regional Conferences, how we can so arrange these as to contribute in the largest possible fashion to the increase of the spirit of actual unity and

mutual confidence. Is not that so? I am not quite in sympathy with Dr. Moore's suggestions for five Regional Conferences. I want six. If I were dividing to-day, with the present information that I have, the white Conferences of these United States of the two Episcopal Methodisms, I would divide somewhat after this fashion: I would take the territory east of the Mississippi River and divide it into a Northeast Conference, and a North Central, a Southeast, and a South Central, or four divisions east of the Mississippi. I would take the territory west of the Mississippi and divide it into Northwest and Southwest Divisions. In three of those Regional Conferences the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and in three the Methodist Episcopal Church would have a majority of the membership. I would make up the General Conference from an equal number from each of these six Regional Conferences. I would give to the three Regional Conferences in which the Church, South, would have a majority of membership equal representation with the other three. I would then make the provision that any questions occurring or coming before the General Conference—upon any questions it should be possible to call for a vote by Regional delegations, and it should require a majority of the Regional delegation to pass any action upon which a division was called. I think I will quit there.

R. E. Blackwell: I have a feeling that we of the South are more sensitive about this matter than anybody else. If we could get satisfied about this, it would not make any difference to us how many you had in your Northern section.

Bishop Hoss: Give us what we want; then take what you please.

R. E. Blackwell: This is what I think would happen. I want, as a great many people in the South want, to break the solid South.

Bishop Hamilton: Amen!

Bishop Hoss: I would say amen to that if you will break up New England solidarity.

R. E. Blackwell: If we could devise some plan for dividing up the Southern Conferences which would be satisfactory to them, leaving power to change the dividing line later on, we should have solved the problem as far as the South is concerned. We of the South have some fear of uniting with a larger body, a fear that must be allayed. Any plan of division will be good to begin with that the Southern people will agree to. We were talking about the matter at the table to-day. The men from Texas said they would be willing to be joined to the West. "To Kansas?" "Yes, nobody in the South would hesitate to be joined with Kansas since the last election." Get any sort of division that will satisfy us in the South at first, and I believe we should

grow together and finally get the division of territory that will be best and have the kind of union that we all in our hearts desire.

Bishop Mouzon: I wonder if the Commission would grant me the privilege of giving the results of a questionnaire on this point. I sent out a questionnaire to about one hundred and fifty leading members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, this being sent to men in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, and elsewhere. Among other questions, I said: "How would you view placing Texas in the Southwestern jurisdiction?" Fully ninety per cent said they thought that was the thing that should be done. I doubt if five answers received said they were opposed to it. Some few said: "We are entirely willing to leave that to the Commission." Naturally, I think I agree with what they said.

Bishop Cooke: Did you have in your mind how extensive a jurisdiction that Southwest jurisdiction would be?

Bishop Mouzon: I had in my mind Texas and New Mexico, probably on to the coast, and Arkansas, possibly Missouri, and Kansas and Colorado.

Bishop Cooke: Yes, I see. That was the territory I had in my mind, the Southwestern jurisdiction of the Church.

C. M. Bishop: I do not agree with my friend Dr. Blackwell in his statement of the Southern position. I do not think we are especially sensitive with reference to the probable division into jurisdictions in the South. The South is concerned, I think, with reference to the question of Jurisdictional Conferences as a means to be used for the protection of minorities in certain possible circumstances and also as units or instruments of more efficient administration. We have thought about that perhaps longer than the brethren know and perhaps have been more careful because we were sensitive on that subject, and we insist upon the plan agreed upon in the Joint Commission and by both General Conferences that there should be a General Conference and Jurisdictional Conferences. We will not have any trouble among ourselves if we get together on other issues in adjusting the jurisdictional boundaries, not to such an extent as at all to hinder unification. I have not found any special feeling on that subject anywhere at all, because we do not conceive in the South that these separate jurisdictional lines will at all interfere with the oneness of the Church, with the unity that shall prevail across all these invisible lines. Church letters will carry members across, and the transfer power will carry ministers across, and all sorts of general enterprises will carry our interests across. We do not propose to constitute a lot of little Churches. We propose to unify Methodism in America, so reorganized as to give it larger efficiency and appeal both to the

local loyalties and to the widespread general interests of every earnest Methodist in the world. I think such an achievement as that is not at all impossible. The details will be difficult to work out, but patience will do it.

E. B. Chappell: A word by way of reconciliation. Bishop McDowell seems to be afraid that somehow some kind of a divisional arrangement may be made safe by which we shall be separated into five or six Churches instead of constituting one great Church. I do not see how, with the general plan that we have before us, that can by any means be possible. It seems to me that with the General Conference, composed of delegates from every section of the country, with our great boards for the whole Church planning our mission and Church extension work, and with constant transfer of preachers from one jurisdiction to another, there will be a constant touch between the several divisions and a constant flowing of life from one region to another that will keep up the vital unity, the very best kind of unity, and will at the same time give us that kind of diversity that makes for richness and fullness of life, for the fullest development of those special verities of life that grow up under peculiar conditions existing here and there in different regions of our country. And I think that will have a very important bearing on our national life. Whatever we may think about the kind of nationalism that is intensifying difficulties between the great countries of the world to-day, we realize, and especially we realize it in this country, where there is such a diversity of races, the importance of unifying our national life so far as we possibly can. I believe that such an intermingling of spiritual forces as will result from a great unified Methodism would tend to unify our national life. I cannot see how, with that interchange of work and that constant vitality of relationship in work, there would be any possibility of such wide separation of these sections one from another as some of our brethren seem to fear.

H. N. Snyder: I did not intend to say anything at this time until I found my two Southern friends, Blackwell and Bishop, differing. There are sections in the South. Dr. Blackwell comes, I believe, more nearly to things as they are, and things as they really are is what we are up against. Whether we want to be academically just, that is another question. I mean this: If you take the growing, the reading, and the thinking people of Southern Methodism, they know as well as you know that the logic of everything is now moving toward one Methodism in America. Besides, there is a considerable group of younger men coming on, North and South, who cannot show much feeling over a good many historical things some of the rest of us can. That is another way of saying that they do not understand why we have

not long ago been in some sense one Church in this country. This, however, does not take into view all of us. There is a great mass of our Methodist folk in the South that know only one Church, and deep in their hearts they do not want to know any other. It is their Church. Then they have their peculiar conceptions about what happened in the past, what may happen in the future, and they are sensitive about the things which may be doing here. That leads me to this: Whatever we do, we have got to recognize that sensitiveness and give it a chance to do a little growing that we may gradually come together rather than try an abrupt throwing of us together. So in this matter of the Regional Conferences I do think, for the sake of the future, and for the sake of the unity of the spirit that every man of us is for, about which we most care, we must take these things that I have mentioned into account. I think, therefore, that we must hold steadily in consideration the different regions of the South itself as well as of the whole country to-day; and if I had time fully to express myself, I believe I could show why I should not want to wipe out the things that make us sectional. I should not like, for example, to destroy that peculiar institution called New England. I should like to put it into a glass case and keep parts of it forever, because some of its qualities are too valuable even to think of losing. And so there are some things among us of the South that we want to hold to. Thus the general point is that the Westerner and even the Southwesterner cannot always see just what the lower South, the Southeast feels. Therefore, even within the South itself, we feel and think sectionally about many of these matters, and with this condition we must reckon when we place the boundaries of the Regional Conferences.

J. M. Moore: It is now five o'clock. To-morrow is Sunday. I think it might be well if we now closed up for the time. I move that we adjourn.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The rule is to adjourn to 9:30 in the morning. Of course that means Monday morning.

Bishop Cranston: After such a day as this, how can we adjourn without a prayer of thanksgiving to God? It seems to me we ought to spend a moment in recognizing the presence of the Spirit of peace and love and brotherly kindness and wisdom. God certainly has presided here to-day. I am going to take the liberty to ask Bishop Mouzon to lead us in prayer.

Bishop Denny: Is it not necessary before we do that to complete our business and to appoint some committees? I do not quite understand the report of our Secretary this morning to be as we had agreed upon. That is not his fault. I am not laying any complaint against him. But I understand that we were to have these committees appointed so that they could be taking into consideration the results of the discussion and be the better

prepared to bring in some recommendations. I rise simply to ask what shall we do about these committees? Is it the pleasure of the Commission that we shall have these committees, or not?

Bishop Cranston: The impression of the Chair this morning was that that matter had been left to go over until the completion of the discussions provided for by the reports of the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

J. F. Goucher: How many of the Commission are accompanied by their wives? How many would like to take their wives with them to-morrow afternoon to the service at the grave of Bishop Asbury? We would like to furnish automobile accommodations for your wives.

A. J. Lamar: I desire to suggest this: I think we are in some danger of wasting a good deal of valuable time and of missing entirely the purpose of your Committee in recommending that these committees be appointed. These committees could not go into operation until Monday morning. By previous agreement of your body these committees are to be constituted by the election of the separate Commissions. Would it not be well for the separate Commissions to have a brief meeting to-night and fill these positions?

Bishop Denny: Our Chairman selects ours, by our action.

H. W. Rogers: I think Bishop Cranston misunderstood the purpose of the Committee on Organization and Procedure. It was the understanding of the Committee that these committees should be appointed at the close of the discussion. But that meant that after a discussion on the powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—of the General Conference a committee should be appointed to deal with that subject and that at the close of the discussions on the various other subjects committees should be appointed to consider those respective subjects instead of holding up the appointment of the various committees until after the discussion had closed.

G. W. Brown: When Dr. Moore rose to suggest adjournment he said because to-morrow is Sunday. It occurred to me that that was just exactly the reason why we ought to consider if we could do something to occupy our time. I take it that with some of us our time is important. We must regard this situation from the standpoint of observing the principle of conservation of time. We are looking toward this whole proposition as though we had all kinds of time ahead of us. But we ought to conserve time, lest some of us have to leave before we have had a chance to consider all these important things that demand our attention.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I understood the purpose of the Committee as Dr. Rogers stated it, modified by the suggestion that you might find it wise to put all in one committee.

D. G. Downey: I think Judge Rogers has properly stated what was in the mind of the Committee last night. However, it is a fact that, notwithstanding that recommendation, the number of the committees and the subjects to be assigned to them would still be within the purview of this general Joint Commission. I am not clear at this moment that the three subjects just as we are discussing them are the subjects on which committees should be appointed. That some of these subjects run into one another is quite evident. I do not think that we are losing any time by not appointing these committees to-day. Surely no member of any committee would want to be absent from the discussion of the next topic, which will come on Monday morning. The ministerial members of this Commission are occupied to-morrow morning. We are all occupied to-morrow afternoon and to-morrow night. I do not see how we are losing time. I would like to see these committees appointed, but I am anxious that when they are appointed we shall appoint just the right committees and assign to them just the right subjects. I do not suppose any brother here expects we shall get anything like a report from any committee that may be appointed. I do not think we can do very much more while here at this time than to get light from the Joint Commission and the mind of the Joint Commission, as we have been getting to-day, and then probably appoint our committees and go home and deliberate and discuss and come together at a later time with the matured judgment of these committees before us for action.

Bishop Hoss: I sincerely am anxious to get two or three words out of my mind. One of them is "provisional," the other is "tentative." I might enumerate several others. They have become a distress to me. I have been considering all of them for more than twenty years. We are here at a considerable expense to our Churches. You may be rich enough in the North not to think that a matter of any moment. But in the South we are somewhat oppressed by the fact that this is a costly meeting to us. I should be very happy if we get something that is entirely definite before we leave here. To go back and tell our people simply that we have had another talk fest and had an interesting time and made good speeches and kept in good humor and behaved like Christian gentlemen—that has become rather irksome to me. It ought to be taken for granted now. It is not a matter of such extraordinary significance as to deserve especial mention, that we are Christians and gentlemen. I would be willing to stay all next week rather than go home and have to come back in a few months. I want to get somewhere and reach some entirely definite conclusion before we leave.

T. D. Samford: While it is a considerable sacrifice for some of us to be here, it is much more important for those who con-

120. Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

template remaining to the end that we know somewhere about the time when the end will be, that we may make our arrangements accordingly. If there is any authority that can suggest that approximately, I will be much obliged if they will do so.

E. C. Reeves: If those committees are appointed, what are we to do while they are considering? Pray for them? Why not appoint a couple of these committees and let them mature reports, and then while other reports are being matured we can consider those.

J. M. Moore: The number of committees and the kind of committees were presented to us this morning. We did not appoint the committees because we thought it would perhaps be better to hear the discussion and then determine whether we would have separate committees or a joint committee. I believe it would be better for a committee to take this matter under advisement, and I move that the matter be recommitted to the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

J. F. Goucher: I move that five committees be appointed, consisting of ten each; that to one of these committees shall be referred the Conferences, which would include possibly six—that would be for them to determine—the General Conference, the Judicial Conference (if we have one, as I hope we shall), the Regional Conferences, the Annual Conferences, the District Conferences, and the Quarterly Conferences. That would be the work of one committee. The second committee should be a Committee on the Itinerancy. To that should be referred all matters pertaining to the bishops, presiding elders, traveling preachers, local preachers, and exhorters. The third committee should be on membership. Fourth, a Committee on Benevolences, including Sunday schools and education. Fifth, a Committee on Book Concern and other financial interests. Each committee to include one bishop, two ministers, and two laymen from each Commission.

Bishop Hoss: Do you propose to eliminate the suggestions of the Committee concerning the committees to be appointed?

J. F. Goucher: I think this is in line with that.

Edwin M. Randall: Where would you classify the Epworth League?

J. F. Goucher: Under the committee dealing with education. In my judgment, it would be impossible for a committee to discuss and report wisely upon any one of these questions without due reference to the other questions. If we have a General Conference, it must have defined relations to the Regional or Synodical Conferences. If we are proposing to create this Regional or Synodical Conference, it will have to be cut out in a sense of the general distribution as it is now. The functions of our General Conference will have to be considerably modified.

It may not require much modification in the Annual Conferences. Nevertheless, they all would have to be adjusted to each other. There may be very little desire for a District Conference. If so, the committee need not report on it. And there is the Quarterly Conference. My judgment is that if we should have a strong committee of ten, who can give the subject of Conferences the wisest, most comprehensive, and detailed consideration (for wise legislation will not come as an inspiration), this committee might report three or four months hence a satisfactory adjustment of the various relations and functions of the various Conferences. The Committee on Itinerancy could take into consideration the election of bishops and their functions, the limitations of the presiding eldership, the functions of our traveling preachers and their transfers, and the matters pertaining to local preachers and exhorters. I think we would get a comprehensive and consequential report if such a committee took this whole section into view. Third would be the question of membership. We are going to have some very interesting and large questions concerning our benevolences. Some kind of an arrangement is desirable by which every benevolence can contribute to the success of every other benevolence without competition or interference. It should be determined as to whether the benevolences are under general boards, with regional bureaus, etc. So also concerning education, the Epworth League, and the Sunday school—should they be under the administration of one committee, or how can efficiency and economy of administration be most largely realized? Then there are large questions concerning the Book Concern and financial matters in general. If we had five committees of ten each, we could get at something definite, constructive, coördinated, and leading somewhere.

Bishop Cooke: I want to know from Dr. Goucher if it is in his thought that each committee report separately or the committees of both Commissions report.

J. F. Goucher: One committee of ten. They might discuss separately, but together formulate their report.

Bishop Mouzon: I think that such committees should be appointed, but not now. We have not yet gotten that far. There are some things that should be settled first. I would like now to inquire what is the next item that our Committee on Procedure suggests should be taken up.

The Secretary: The status of the colored membership in the reorganized Church.

Bishop Mouzon: The Committee on Procedure has determined that there were three matters of vital importance which should be settled first: the General Conference and its powers; the Jurisdictional Conference, its powers and the number; and the status of the colored membership in the reorganized

Church. I should like very much before we go any farther—I mean to say before any committees are appointed—that we should take up very carefully and prayerfully the discussion of the third item. The motion of Dr. Goucher contravenes directly the purpose of your Committee on Procedure. It would be entirely useless, it would be disappointing, if we appointed these five committees and in a general way discussed matters and went to our homes. Our Churches would be disappointed. They would say: "You have done nothing." I should like, if possible, that we might have a night session. I am entirely willing to come here and work to-night. I would particularly desire to do so in order that after we have carefully discussed the third item the holy Sabbath day might intervene before anything else is done and that all these vital problems in their full bearing might be before us when we meet again. I move that when we adjourn it be to meet at eight o'clock this evening.

H. W. Rogers: I heartily second that motion. We laymen are very busy men. It is a very trying and difficult position that we are put in to be here at all. It seems to me that we are wasting a good deal of time to adjourn and do nothing to-night, not even the appointment of committees. It is suggested that we cannot report. That is true, but there is advantage in conferring together. I earnestly hope we may push our work with more vigor than we have done. We lost last night. We are proposing to lose to-night unless this motion just made is carried. I earnestly hope we shall meet to-night.

Bishop Cranston took the chair, and Bishop Candler said: I hope we shall not meet to-night. I have known a great deal of mischief done at night sessions of congresses, General Conferences, Annual Conferences, etc. Besides, we have a watch night service to-morrow night. That will try some of us old men. You might appoint your committees. If their report is here Monday morning, we shall really save time by that. If we are here to-night, your committee cannot meet to make appointments. I hope that the motion that when we adjourn it be to meet this evening will not prevail.

Bishop Candler resumed the chair.

P. D. Maddin: I want to second the motion of Judge Rogers that we have a night session. We took up one of these items and discussed and finished it in about an hour and a half. This afternoon we finished the second item in less than two hours. If we come to-night, we can finish the discussion of the third item and then appoint the committees and let every man know on what committee he is to be. On Monday they can take action.

Bishop Cranston: We are in very poor condition to talk about a matter so serious as that which it is proposed to take up to-night. It is the most crucial question we have. We want to be in complete possession of ourselves and all of us in the Spirit of God. I know the call is very strenuous upon some of our lay brethren. But if we get to moving in that fashion, I am afraid we shall spoil some of our good work, which so far has been excellent. We ought to have Monday morning for this great question, when we are fresh with the inspiration of the Sabbath day. Further, we cannot construct these committees to-night. As it stands now, with Dr. Goucher's motion and the preference of some for the report of the committee, we shall have to decide between them. It seems to me that if we meet at all to-night it should be to determine what committees we shall have.

Frank Neff: It is not only the laymen who are busy; it is the preachers. Where I come from at least they are expecting us to let them know whether we are getting together. I am ashamed for us to go home and say we have done nothing but appoint committees. Every last mother's son of us knows what he thinks about these matters. We have been thinking over this and praying over it and talking over it. The Church press has been full of it. The whole Church is full of it. And whether you are or not, I am full of it. I know my mind on a great many of these questions. I believe the thing for us to do is to appoint the three committees that have to do with these three great items—the one discussed this morning, the one discussed this afternoon, and the one we can discuss to-night if this motion is passed—and then meet Monday morning in committee sessions. Meet Monday morning, Monday afternoon, and Monday night if necessary. By that time some committee ought to be ready to report. It is not necessary to carry out all the final details of organization. The thing necessary for us now is to come together and report everything that we are ready to act on. We surely ought to be able to come here Tuesday morning and report whether or not we can agree on something.

M. L. Walton: I am a very busy man with court business coming on. But I do not know any man who does not have some time off on Saturday night. We have been here all through this day. We were here yesterday in two sessions. I know our good friend Dr. Goucher has made provision for a reception at his home to-night for half the members of the Commission. Perhaps others have made arrangements about various matters. A number of members are absent. What Bishop Candler says about this matter is very pertinent. Superadded to that, what Bishop Cranston has said is also

very relevant. Why should we hasten this matter? I have not attempted to raise my voice on this floor, because I saw so many people anxious to do it. As a lawyer I am tired of a whole lot of gush, mush, and talk. I believe in action, but deliberate, conscientious action. This question that we are going into is a matter as to which I do not know whether it is necessary to argue fully or not. We know that there have to be concessions made on one side or on all sides. I do not know whether the talk will be so absolutely necessary as to require us to attend here to-night. Brother Brown says he is a busy man, but he has all his business well organized. Here is Judge Rogers, who has his circuit duties in hand. Also Judge Robinson is here. It does seem to me that we are doing all that could be expected of us. I do not believe in any undue haste about this matter, but I do believe that we ought to select all three of these committees. My idea was to select them in advance of any argument in the case, so that they could hear everything, sitting as a jury where first impressions were made on them. Then they ought to retire and bring in a verdict according to their enlightened conscience and the purposes involved in this matter. I want to ask you and appeal to you to let us take off to-night and pray over this matter. Let us attend these different services on Sunday and come here fresh in the discharge of our duties with all the sanctities of the occasion in our hearts and lives and memories. Then we shall be prepared for right and wise and deliberate Christian action.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The motion before you is to meet this evening, which takes precedence of these other subsidiary motions.

W. N. Ainsworth: It occurs to me that we are not quite prepared to appoint committees with the wide range indicated by Dr. Goucher. It occurs to me that it is exceedingly important that we should come to some definite conclusion before we leave Baltimore as to the complexion and the province of the General Conference, the number, complexion, and province of the Jurisdictional Conferences, and the status of the negro in the reorganized Church. I think we should give ourselves to these three questions before we consider any others. I shall be prepared, therefore, when the way is clear to move that we come together on Monday morning with the Joint Commission prepared to announce three committees of ten each, five from each side, on the three questions I have just suggested. If we order that this evening, the Commissions can have their meetings this evening and be ready to report on Monday.

R. E. Blackwell: All that the Judge said just now leads me

to think that we ought to meet here to-night. I think we ought to get out of the way the question of whether we shall have three committees or six committees. We certainly ought to have the committee appointed to consider the question we are to discuss. We were much pleased last night when we heard that it was the arrangement to have the committees appointed beforehand. We understand that you could not report this first committee because you had to discuss. But we thought, of course, that as soon as we discussed this matter this afternoon the committee would be appointed and that the committee would have the things simmering in its mind all day Sunday. If I knew Judge Rogers was on that committee, I should want to talk with him. We are throwing away our time. We would better get some of these things out of our way.

Edgar Blake: I cannot convince myself that it is entirely wise that the Joint Commission shall meet this evening for the discussion of the subject that will be before us. Personally, I feel that when the Commission comes to discuss that subject, if we shall deem it wise to discuss it in the Joint Commission first, that ought to come to us when the spirit of weariness is not upon us, when we are entirely fresh for its consideration. It is the most delicate and the most difficult that this Joint Commission will have to face, as these different subjects appear to me. I hope for that reason that we shall not meet this evening. I do appreciate the need of these committees being appointed at the earliest moment that they can be appointed intelligently. I do not believe the committees could have been appointed in the wisest manner at the close of this morning's discussion. Had we appointed a committee on the topic of the morning, it would have been a committee to consider the composition and judicial and legislative functions of the General Conference. It must be apparent to all of us who have listened carefully to the discussion this afternoon that the committee that considers the powers of the General Conference will have to be the committee that will consider the powers of the Quadrennial Conferences. It would appear to me, if I may make a suggestion, that, inasmuch as this matter of the Judicial Conference (if that is what you are pleased to call it) to pass upon the constitutionality of the acts of these several legislative bodies constitutes a question quite distinct from the legislative function of these Quadrennial Conferences and the General Conference, you will want to have a committee created to consider that matter in all its details of character, composition, authority, to report to us at a later meeting. Then it seems to me that we might well have a committee to consider the

legislative function of the General Conference and the Quadrennial Conferences, including the number and boundaries of the latter. Then it is very clear to most of us that this third subject contains a subject that is quite separate from these other two—the status of the colored membership of the reorganized Church. I am not certain but that a representative committee might be appointed and proceed to the consideration of that topic without any preliminary discussion in this Joint Committee.

Bishop Hoss: You take it for granted, then, that we have proceeded so far in considering the matter of the Judicial Conference that we are ready now to take up the question of its character and composition?

Edgar Blake: I can speak only for myself. I will say that, unless more definite sentiment shall develop later than that developed this morning, it would seem to me we are ready for it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We have but one question before us—that is, whether you will meet to-night—and the Chair cannot hear discussion.

E. C. Reeves: I have tried to be in order. I think they have all been out of order and the Chair too. This question of adjournment has been recognized until it has turned to be something else, but it has not been unified. It has been diversified. We had better adjourn, especially as I have an important engagement with Dr. Goucher.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion before you is that when you adjourn it will be to meet this evening.

The vote was taken, and the motion was lost.

J. F. Goucher: With the consent of my second, I will withdraw my motion.

Edgar Blake: There was a motion made by Dr. Moore to the effect that the matter of the appointment of committees be referred to the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

Bishop Cranston: Will the separate Commissions get together and make their nominations for the separate committees?

The question arose as to whether there should be three committees or more.

Secretary Thomas read from the report of the Committee that it was recommended that following the general discussion of the subject the committees be appointed.

Dr. Moore's motion to adjourn was put and carried.

The session adjourned with prayer, and the benediction pronounced by Bishop Mouzon.

BALTIMORE, December 31, 1916.

At 3:30 P.M. the members of the Joint Commission and others assembled in Mount Olivet Cemetery, near the grave of Bishop Asbury, and conducted service as follows:

Bishop Denny called for the singing of the hymn, "Children of the Heavenly King."

Prayer, Rev. Frank M. Thomas.

Scripture, Bishop Collins Denny.

Address, Bishop F. D. Leete.

Hymn, "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing."

Benediction, Bishop Earl Cranston.

WATCH NIGHT SERVICE.

At 9:30 P.M. watch night services were held in Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with Bishop W. B. Murrah in charge. The service was as follows:

Scripture, Bishop Murrah.

Prayer, Rev. H. M. Du Bose.

Hymn.

Addresses by Bishop Murrah, Rev. C. B. Spencer, and Rev. D. G. Downey.

After a brief intermission, Bishop J. W. Hamilton took charge of the service.

Prayer by Bishop R. J. Cooke.

Hymn.

Addresses by Rev. T. N. Ivey and Rev. W. N. Ainsworth.

Bishop Hamilton called the members of the Joint Commission to the altar for a final service of prayer and consecration. The Commissioners knelt in silent prayer, and prayer was then offered by Bishop Candler and Bishop Cranston.

The service closed with the singing of the hymn, "Come, Let Us Anew Our Journey Pursue," and benediction by Bishop Hamilton.

FOURTH DAY, MONDAY, JANUARY 1, 1917.

At 9:40 A.M. Bishop Candler called the meeting to order, and a hymn was sung, "My Faith Looks Up to Thee."

At the moment of opening only twelve members of the Commission were present, but a large number came in during the singing of the hymn.

A. J. Lamar offered prayer.

Secretary A. W. Harris called the roll. The following were present: From the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Bishops E. E. Hoss, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah; ministers, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar; laymen, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds,

128 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

E. C. Reeves, H. H. White. From the Methodist Episcopal Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke; ministers, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer; laymen, G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr.

Bishop Denny, Dr. Blake, and John R. Pepper came in.

Secretary Harris read the minutes of Saturday afternoon's session, which, with slight alterations, were approved.

Bishop Cranston took the chair.

Bishop McDowell: I move that we request from Bishop Candler the manuscript of the sermon delivered at the opening of our session in order that it may be published officially by the authority of the Joint Commission in such form as may be determined by the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

The motion was adopted.

Bishop Cooke: Before we enter upon the immediate questions which were before us at our last business session, I would like, with the consent of the whole body, to present a paper here, germane to the whole subject before us, a simple statement of certain principles, which I would desire to go to the Committee on Organization and Procedure. I wish to present this paper solely on my own responsibility. But I earnestly desire to have the privilege as a member of the Commission of presenting it to you for your consideration.

On motion of Bishop Hoss, the rules were suspended, and Bishop Cooke was invited to present his paper.

Bishop Cooke presented the following paper:

Whereas the General Conferences of the two Episcopal Methodisms have committed both Churches to unification by reorganization; and whereas reorganization is not confined or limited to any one method, nor has either General Conference determined with exact precision any one specific method which cannot be in anywise modified—therefore resolved that these following principles shall be adopted as principles of unification:

1. There shall be one Church.
2. There shall be one General Conference, in which the two uniting Churches shall have equal representation.
3. There shall be one Judicial Conference, or final court of appeals.
4. There shall be one Board or College of Bishops.
5. There shall be one Board of each of the several benevolences, with even distribution in the whole Church, North, South, East, and West.
6. The General Conference shall have full power to make laws, rules, and regulations for the whole Church under constitutional provisions and restrictions.
7. The Judicial Council shall determine all appeals coming to it from Annual and Judicial Conferences and from the General Conference. The Judicial Conference shall report its decisions to the General Conference.

If on constitutional questions the General Conference shall fail to approve the decision of the Judicial Council, the question involved shall go down to the Annual Conferences for final adjudication.

8. *The Annual Conferences.*—The Annual Conferences shall have full power, under constitutional provisions and restrictions, to make all laws, rules, and regulations in matters of local interest, such as education, philanthropy, and efficient administration in all departments of Christian activity.

9. Should the sixth Restrictive Rule be retained in the united Church for the preservation of episcopacy, it shall be so changed as to read in the latter part as follows: "The bishop assigned to missionary work in Africa shall not be limited in his superintendency to that mission alone, but shall have jurisdiction over the colored work in America also."

Respectfully submitted as an outline of principles.

Bishop McDowell: I understood Bishop Cooke to say that he desired that paper to go to the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

Bishop Cooke: That is, if you do not care to consider it now.

Bishop McDowell: I understood that the rule was suspended simply that it might now be presented. Was that the purpose of Bishop Hoss?

Bishop Hoss: I think it ought to go to the committee.

Bishop McDowell: I arise to move that this be the disposition of it.

This motion was seconded by Bishop Candler.

H. M. Du Bose: Let me ask Bishop Cooke what a right to equal representation means.

Bishop Cooke: The thought is this, that what is now the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, shall have in that General Conference equal representation with the Methodist Episcopal Church, equal numbers. That is what is meant.

The paper was referred to the Committee on Organization and Procedure.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Will you indulge the Chair in a single remark concerning the discussion before us? It has occurred to me that we shall make better progress in our work if we realize at the outset this morning that what we are to aim at, in view of our own repeated declarations and the spirit of our prayers, is the pleasing of God and the extension of his kingdom and that we shall perhaps make better headway and be in a better spirit of service if we should take up our problem constructively—how can we in the reorganized Church best serve the negro?—rather than to revert constantly to our disagreements in the past or to any attitude which it may be fancied either of our Churches may now hold in regard to the question. How can we best serve the negro? Is not that the Christ standpoint?

H. M. Du Bose: Are we now open for that discussion?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I understand that the question now is, "What shall be the status of the negro in the reorganized Church?"

H. M. Du Bose: I respectfully submit as a member of the Commission from the South that we should like to hear freely and fully from our brethren constituting the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church their candid and complete presentation of the case from their side. I venture to make this statement, that we invite the freest and fullest statement from them of their deepest thought on this matter. Then we shall be prepared to respond in the same spirit.

Bishop Cooke: I should like to ask Dr. Du Bose, in order that the full, clear, frank statement may come from us for which he asks us, what he would like for us to do in order that we may have before us that upon which we could unite. We do not know what would be acceptable. If he would simply state to us what he would like for us to do, we could take it under consideration and frankly say what we could do with it.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have not taken this matter under advisement to the extent of trying to reach an agreement that would authorize anybody to speak for us.

H. M. Du Bose: I feel that the time has passed for any reserve in this matter at all. We have been here several days and have now reached a crucial juncture in our affairs. We ought to be frank. Since I have been personally invited to do so, on my own responsibility I will state very briefly what have been my views, matured so far as they could be matured in recent months. I will state what I would like to see. You can take it for what it is worth. I have the most cordial feeling toward the colored brethren, both in your jurisdiction and the brethren who are related to our own jurisdiction; indeed, our colored brethren everywhere. It is quite a trite saying that we love our brethren of African descent. That might go without question and without confirmation. I am sure we shall understand that. I want us to be in the most intimate and most fraternal relations to these brethren. I want them to be part of our Church, to share the privileges of Methodism, and to enjoy the dignities and the experiences of Methodism in the largest degree. I think we have had in the relationships which have subsisted between our own Church and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in the South an ideal relation. We have not used it ideally. Of that I am sure. It has presented to us a series of ideal opportunities. In a larger and more radical sense, in a more progressive way, I should like to see the same ideal relations in reorganized Methodism. I have written out a plan *in extenso*.

In plain language, it contemplates this plan: that there shall be organized alongside the white membership of the reorganized Church a connection to bear the same name, perhaps to have some distinguishing description, an adjunct or a substantive title to indicate that it is a colored connection and that into it shall go the colored contingent of the Methodist Episcopal Church and what I am pleased to describe as the colored contingent of our own Church, for I believe that the colored people in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church will follow our brotherly suggestions in this matter. I happen to know that they are favorable to it. Organize our colored membership into an independent connection, having its own General Conference, its own general superintendency, its own officiary, its own boards, its own administration. Let us estimate what would be the reasonable interest of our colored brethren in our vested and common funds, in our publishing plants, and in whatever else we have. Let us double this sum and levy it as an assessment on the reorganized Church, to be paid in a series of annual installments until the whole sum is discharged. Let us organize a joint commission, composed equally of colored and of white brethren, to be a nexus between these two connections of the same Church, to administer first of all this fund of rightfulness, and then also to administer any other fund that may be raised for the institution, advancement, and efficiency of the boards and enterprises of the colored connection. Let that colored connection be in every sense a part of the reorganized Church, only having its own General Conference, starting out with the same constitution that we have used, modified to meet their needs, but of course to be modified by them as they may find it necessary in the course of the years. Let this joint connectional commission be an administrative body and the living nexus between the two Churches, each contingent of it to be appointed by the respective General Conferences, the twenty-five men, say, from the white connection to be appointed by the General Conference of that connection and the twenty-five colored brethren to be appointed by the General Conference of the colored connection. Let there be a most fraternal and most complete intimacy, an absolutely unified relationship between these bodies. Let us do our colored brethren justice in the matter of giving them what belongs to them. Give them their schools, colleges, church buildings, any funds that they may have vested interests in, and then stay by them perpetually if necessary to institute and make efficient their organization. Also I would have the boards—[at this point the speaker's time expired, but was extended]—I would have the boards of the reorganized Church—that

is, of the white connection—under the direction and authorization of the General Conference, maintain constant movements of extension and expansion and evangelistic effort, making the relationship between them as intimate as, and even more intimate than, they are now, more effective than they are now, certainly more than they are in our relationship; in this wise maintain a most perfectly fraternal intimacy, one that will grow and will secure confidence, and by that means give to our colored brethren an arena of activity, a theater of operations, that will fit them for complete independency, so far as that is needed, and strengthen their self-reliance and in every way meet the large demands of race consciousness.

Bishop McDowell: I do not rise to discuss the matter, but simply to say what the Chairman of the morning has already stated, that the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church has not voted upon or agreed upon any statement to be made, that we could make, touching this matter. I am sure we are grateful for the contribution which Dr. Du Bose has just now made. It will be remembered that the Joint Commission—I mean the Federal Council—had a paragraph in its suggestions touching this subject. That paragraph was modified by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and then was reaffirmed by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Up to date that is the only statement of position that has been formally made within our Church. It will be remembered that on the first day of the Commission, when we were interpreting our powers as a Commission, Bishop Candler spoke for the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and made a very careful and, as we all felt, a very kindly statement on this particular matter. It was, I am sure, by him left purposely somewhat free from sharp definitions. Yet I am sure also that it would be a great satisfaction to the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church if the brethren from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were to interpret to us the paragraph to which I refer a little more fully in order that we may not only have their spirit in this matter, but have a little more clearly than we have had their thought in this matter. It is no time at all for any of us to be withholding what is in our minds from one another, and I am sure that in the spirit of the whole session up to this time such statement could be made with great profit.

Bishop Hamilton: Will you or some one read that paragraph, that we may have it clearly before us?

Secretary Thomas read as follows: "To be dealt with in such manner as shall give full recognition to race conscious-

ness, while at the same time offering to them the largest possible coöperation."

John M. Moore: There are four large bodies of negro Methodists in the United States, counting the body within the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are about 340,000 negro members in the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are about 275,000 of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, about 580,000 of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and about 620,000 of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Among these four branches of negro Methodism will be found all the competition, altar against altar, friction and strife that you would find among the white Methodist Episcopal Churches. Now, the purpose of our coming together and of the unification of American Methodism is not merely the bringing together of our two branches, but if possible the removing of this friction, strife, altar against altar. Whatever plan we may or should have in view, there is this large number of negro Methodists, put it at about a million and a half, outside the Churches that we here represent. I believe we ought to form a plan that will give the white Church, the white Methodists, a chance to do the largest possible service for the negro Methodists. I have been working along the lines of service for them recently as Secretary of Home Missions in my Church, and I have come to realize that they need us and will welcome any service that we are able to render. I am in full sympathy with the views advanced by Dr. Du Bose. The fact is, I have thought for several months that what we need to do is to organize our white membership into one Church and then put our negro membership in another Church and create a nexus, one that will hold the property that might be turned over from the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Protestant Church to the negro membership, and would also administer the funds that might be appropriated by the white Church for the negro Church. I believe that if we would take this nexus and enlarge its functions, as Dr. Du Bose has indicated, we would be agreeing upon some plan that would be acceptable to all. If we let the negro membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church form simply a Jurisdictional Conference, then when we bring in these other bodies, as we hope eventually to do, all this would have to be broken up unless we admit to the joint Church 2,000,000 negro Methodists, and to admit 2,000,000 negro Methodists into a Church of 8,000,000 would make a General Conference where one-fourth of the membership would be negro Methodists. I do not think that such a system would be desirable or even acceptable to the large body of Methodists in the South. But I believe that if we create

this outstanding body for negro Methodists with a strong nexus, using these men and women who are members of the Methodist Episcopal Church to-day, we would then have formed that body to which these other negro bodies could be joined if they would come in with us. We must remember that, while we hold fraternal relations to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, there is no vital nexus to-day. They are as independent of us from a legal standpoint as are the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. So I think it would be well to carry out the suggestion which Dr. Du Bose has announced this morning of having this negro Church and the white Church and then the nexus. I believe that this is in harmony with the recommendation of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Bishop Mouzon: I observe that we are not doing this morning just what many of us desired to have done. As the problem seems to be chiefly the problem of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it has been the desire of many of us not to say very much. We are quite hesitant about this matter, because it is your problem rather than ours as it appears to us. Now, we have discussed two items. I have the impression that if there were no further difficulties we could come to an understanding touching the two items which we have already discussed—that is to say, we bring up for discussion this morning a crucial question. The outcome of this discussion, the conclusions which we reach touching this matter, will determine whether or not we are to get together. That in itself is a very serious consideration. Is this not a consideration of so great importance as to outweigh certain of our preconceived notions touching this matter, yours and mine as well? Let us consider then the gravity of the situation as we now confront it. Bishop McDowell asked for a word of explanation. I may not be able to make it. I will try. [The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in General Conference assembled, recommended that the colored membership of the Methodist Churches be erected into an independent denomination. Unquestionably that expresses the mind of the Church that I represent to a very large degree.] The Commission of which I am a member desired to give as much leeway to this discussion as possible. We did not desire to bind ourselves nor to bind you hand and foot. We endeavored, therefore, in the statement which we presented to you to give the heart of the matter. We are sure that race consciousness, the race consciousness of the colored people and the race consciousness of the white people, the race consciousness of all peoples, must be taken into consideration.

We believe that this is better for the colored people. We believe that that is necessary to us. Now, on Saturday, I think it was, some one made an address in which he rather discounted this idea of race consciousness. The remark was made that the terrible war in Europe grew out of race consciousness. I think that remark had some weight. But the present world war did not grow out of race consciousness. It grew out of racial conceit. Race consciousness respects race consciousness. The race consciousness of America respects the race consciousness of Great Britain, and the race consciousness of Great Britain respects that of every other nation. And race consciousness must be dealt with. It is certain, as I see it, that, whatsoever we may do now, the colored Methodists of America will some day be together. Is the Methodist Episcopal Church satisfied with its work among the colored people. I am quite sure that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is not satisfied with its work among the colored people. The Methodists are not doing the best work that is being done among the colored people. The Baptists are getting closer to their colored people than we are to ours. You are not altogether satisfied, my brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We are not altogether satisfied; we are far from being satisfied. So what we desire—and I think I speak for the large majority, if not the total membership, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South—what we desire is to do the best thing for the colored people while doing the best thing for ourselves. That is the spirit in which we seek to enter into this. But we are convinced, we are sure, that you must reckon with race consciousness. I think you should consider very carefully what Dr. Du Bose has had to say. I believe that that plan will offer you of the Methodist Episcopal Church every opportunity that you now have, that it will offer to the colored brethren every opportunity they now have in a financial way and in the way of personal assistance. And they need personal friendship and coöperation more than they need money. I believe it will relieve us of difficulties and you of difficulties. I trust you will very carefully consider these things.

Bishop Hamilton: I wish I could have a little more than five minutes. I do not ask it. I hold a peculiar relation to this entire body, as you understand. I did not want to be on this committee. I positively refused to be on the Committee of Sixty in the General Conference, for the very reason that I had served for eight years in charge of the colored people. Very naturally it was supposed by some persons that I would be very likely to prejudice the case. But if you will permit me a few things, I should like to say them. First, I was born

in the South. The blood of the Breckinridges, Prestons, and Floyds runs through my veins. I love the South. I have traveled over nearly every crossroad in it. There is not a town or city of large size in which I have not been. I have dealt with Governors and with the common people. I have slept in the cabins of the poor black people. I have eaten with them, much as that will shock the sensitiveness of people who are so distinct from them. Now, I want to say to you that I have tried to think in the lines of your thinking, but to think with the whole South. You will bear me out that in everything I have said here it has been to go beyond even what our Church has said or at any time has proposed. I do not know any one else that has made the same public concession, if you call it so, that I have tried to make. I have said to you, brethren, that I want you to have an equal number in the Methodist Episcopal Church when it is one Church. I have said that because I do not want any one for a single moment to have the idea that we are to ignore the claim of the minority. Again, I believe that is the only just way to deal with this question. This is the way in which we have begun. Here we are twenty-five, and you are twenty-five, and yet you have only half the membership we have. In making the concession I am referring to equal numbers in the General Conference when it comes together for the first time.

Bishop Denny: You have said "for the first time." Do you mean simply for that one General Conference or to write that into the constitution so that it could continue?

Bishop Hamilton: That is not my expression. I am perfectly willing to have that obtain so far as the General Conference itself will grant it. It will be a matter that will very certainly take care of itself in the course of two or three General Conferences at the most. The second thing I have tried to think with you in and get away from ourselves is this: We do not believe in a supreme court. That is the action during the hundred years of history of the Methodist Episcopal Church. You do, only you locate it in your Board of Bishops in a restricted way. I have felt that you very much felt that there ought to be some such kind of relation between the two bodies, the bishops and the General Conference or some body over and above the General Conference. Therefore I have said to you that I will yield the idea and put it in the form, if you please to call it so, of a compromise and have a supreme court, but not to make the bishops that court, because with us we now as bishops can scarcely find authority enough to make the appointments. And in this country it will very soon be the case, if some of your bishops continue to do as one at least of them has done, that you will not con-

tinue to possess the power in free America to continue that process, put out without consultation and at one stroke of the pen a whole body of presiding elders. [I am trying to think with you, and I want you to come over and learn to think with us. You have spoken on the line of your thinking. There has not been anything from your side thus far that has approached the consideration of our conditions and thinking, certainly no concessions as yet.] We are also in a condition and have a theory. We have got in some way or other to make our conditions conform to our theories when we cannot come to them. You have all been talking as though these colored brethren were as clay, capable of being molded into a desired form, plastic in the hands of white people, and as if we could handle them at our pleasure and do with them as we chose. There are difficulties in this matter that you brethren ought to see. In the first place, we have a body of colored brethren in our Church. You have not in yours, though in some societies you have individual members. It is very natural for Brother Du Bose to follow the course that he has taken. That is in your line of thinking. You have not approached ours at all. What is the condition with us? We went into the South when nearly every State down there had a law making it a crime (during or before the war) to teach the black man a letter. With malice toward none we began our many schools. The South was not in favor of the black man's education. Now you have only two schools down there. One of our generous laymen in the North made a most generous contribution of a building to one of them. We have had these schools all through the South, until to-day we have furnished more well-educated colored ministers and skillful physicians than have come from any other source. We have furnished teachers for the schools. We have furnished a school of medicine the like of which is not to be found on the planet. We have gathered the little children into our embrace. We have a constituency of more than a million adherents. We have treated them as men and brothers. We have made no distinction in the rights they sustain of relationship to our membership, just as is the case with you in your foreign mission fields. You do not begin to organize those converts in the foreign mission field in such way as to reflect upon their rights and privileges as members. We have nearly 350,000 colored members within our borders, each of whom has the rights of every white member. They have come into our fellowship through our tuition. Now, are we going to stand up and take each one of these members individually and say to him: "You go off"? But go off where? The other colored Churches have not agreed to any such ar-

rangement of union as to give them refuge. Your Colored Methodist Episcopal Church as a body may possibly follow your direction, and you could advise them. But here at my side is a brother who has every right that I have. I have no more right to tell him to go out of our Church than he has to tell me to do the same. Therefore I want you to think a little on our side of the case. Moreover, if we should undertake to put these brethren aside, there are civil courts in this country that carry a protection of property and rights. They could secure an injunction on us for attempting to deprive them of certain relations to the superannuated fund and all the other institutions of the Church. Put yourselves in our place. After we have brought all these into the Church as converts and as students into our schools at no small cost of men and women and money, can we say to them, "Brethren, go away"? We do not want to do it. Here is the greatest problem on this continent for you as well as for us—4,000,000 grown to 10,000,000 who require us to care for them and to settle all the questions involved in so doing. I live in Washington, where there are more colored people than in any other city in the world, unless in Africa, and the government makes no distinctions such as separate cars and separate stations, and Southern people conform when they come here as readily as the rest of us. [The time was extended.] I thank you, because I am a frank man. I have been subjected to all manner of abuse and threatened with tar and feathers because I am frank. I am treating you brethren as I would treat my own family. I love every one of you and want to do the right thing; but I want you to think on our side of the question. It was very nice for a brother in a playful way to say: "You let us have our way, and you can do what you please." It was very kind for my brother to say: "I would not do away with New England or Bishop Hamilton, but preserve them both under a glass case." Of course you do not want us under a glass case with all New England—all those radical abolitionists—simply as a curiosity, but you want us there to imprison us and thus get rid of us. But, troublesome as we are, we are in the domain of reason and brotherly love. And that must dominate, whether you or I like it or not. The Church will come to it. "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord." That is the thing we have got to do. I do not know anything under God's heavens that claims an inalienable right to selfishness and prejudice but sin. We have got to get rid of our selfish notions and relationships and think for one another. I live in Washington, as I have said, where the two races are residing together. What has happened there? Intelligent people set the example for be-

havior in all public places, and there is as much respectful consideration for one race as for the other. Foreign diplomacy must respect alike all races and nations. Some of you have been in England and in the North and have sat down at the table with the black man just as we do with never a question. But I can understand that you represent great numbers who do not understand the controlling opinions of our people. You are here speaking for the rank and file back of you. When any one of the greatest prejudice comes up from the South and visits Washington, he does the same thing we all do. He does not propose to withdraw from the government of the United States because it declines to defer to his prejudices. [I want you, therefore, to feel that if this great Church is to be you cannot take up one body of our members and just handle them as though they were so much clay in your hands, to do with as you please. You cannot do it. You must give us credit for having learned something in the fifty years during which we have gathered in our colored membership. Moreover, I will say in the presence of these colored brethren that I do not believe the colored people as a whole are in a condition to handle their own problem. We certainly cannot turn over to them all the property that we have accumulated for years and let them administer it in the same way that we can administer it, coöperating with them. Another thing, these colored brethren feel that they cannot go to some of those colored Churches in the South. They have many justifiable reasons. We never turn a man out for even the grossest crime who cannot the next week get into a Conference of one of those other Churches down there. That has happened in case after case. This is a big problem. But we ought to be big men. We ought to remember that there is some way of treating these brethren as they ought to be treated; that the government of the United States, with its Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and its civil rights bill, puts them in such relation to us that you and I have got to recognize their rights. Can you think for us a bit? We have said already that in our Church we cannot ask these brethren to go out. Are we to bribe them to go out? We have given them every office in our Church except the episcopacy, and we have steadily voted for them for that office. That is startling to most of your people in the South, and nothing would horrify them more than to have a colored bishop that would have the same authority as white bishops. I have steadily opposed the idea of the missionary episcopacy that might classify a black bishop. I do not say that it might not be possible for us to make a proposition that if we would give them a bishop,

elected by the General Conference, who would preside over our colored work in Africa and in this country, it might be a wise concession for us to make. It has been proposed to have them remain in the union if they would agree to sustain such relations to us that, with representation in the General Conference, they would never ask to preside over the General Conferences, which would be in deference to you. But the election of the colored bishop has not yet taken place. When we are united, we shall have only one colored delegate to twenty in the General Conference. Why should we be afraid of one member to twenty? You do not believe in the admission of women of our Church to the General Conference, but how would our women take it if you said you would not unite with us unless we turn the women out of the General Conference? Let us get together and consider what we can do. We have a position that is different from yours. We want you to tell us what as good brothers, loving us, you would have us do. You will have to help us take care of this problem. I ask again: What would you have us do under the circumstances? You know my spirit. There is not a man in this company that could make me mad over this question. You may say what you please, but it is not possible to anger me. I intend to love you, and, before God, I can discuss any question with you and go as far as you can in making conciliation. But come over on our side and think with us and tell us if you are willing to tell these to leave us that you may come with us.

Bishop Hoss: Brother Hamilton is altogether in error in supposing that we have not thought on his side. There is not a man in this Commission, there is scarcely a man of prominence in our Church, who has not tried to go round about this matter, on both sides of it. You are mistaken if you suppose that we do not sympathize with you in your difficulties. We know you have them. I will not say I am sorry for you, because I do not believe a man deserves sympathy for having difficulties. Further, I think Bishop Hamilton is also mistaken about our disposition to take up the colored membership and just do with it as we please. There is not a man among us who dreams it can be done. We did not treat them that way. We had nearly as many at the close of the war, in 1865, as you have now. I venture to say that they were 200,000 of the most intelligent, upright, and worthy colored people in all the world, those gathered under the ministry of Capers and Andrew and others, who will have a special crown, men who were so eminently respected that they could go anywhere and do anything for God's humblest people without being called in question. We did not put the

colored people out of our Church at the close of the war. That has been repeated over and over until nearly everybody believes it who does not know the facts. There are young people among us who do not know the history of their own Church. We had over 200,000 of them before the war closed, but before our General Conference could get together in 1866 150,000 of them had been enticed away from us into other Churches by the promise of loaves and fishes. We did not put them out. They went of their own accord. And it was to save those of them that did not go that at their own request we organized them into a separate Church. They are the only colored Church in the world that has the episcopal succession straight from Thomas Coke. The bishops of the Zion Church and the other African Churches are not in succession at all, apostolic or Methodistic. But our colored bishops were made full bishops without any question. I doubt whether there is a better man on the American continent than Isaac Lane. I was in Jackson, Tenn., when his wife died. The white people of the town filled the house with flowers; his credit is good in any store in the town and at the bank. And he has done an amazing work among his people. How on earth he has managed to raise money for Lane College, in Jackson, and make it one of the best colored schools in the South I do not know. I was at one of his Conferences recently and proceeded to take up a collection from the colored brethren for his own college. I told them that if the Bishop should get to heaven and some of the brethren should follow him there the first question he would ask them would be: "How is Lane College going on?" He was licensed to preach by the same Quarterly Conference and on the same day on which his master was licensed. Now, you have done a great work in the South. But underneath all your work, down at the very bottom of it, is the work that our Church did for a hundred years in the South. There never was a better class of colored local preachers in the world than those trained by Bishop Capers. I have heard Bishop Turner, one of the greatest negroes that ever lived in this country; I do not say one of the best. I was in Boston once, invited there to deliver an address before the Preachers' Meeting on "The Negro Problem as a Southerner Sees It." I said: "That ice is too thin for good skating." Before I got there, Bishop Turner came in and filled in the time until I arrived. He said: "I am much obliged to you for this kind reception. I have been to Boston many times. You always listen to me very politely, and especially when I criticize the South; but I have never slept in one of your beds nor eaten at any of your tables." Bishop, you may state what is the case about

Washington, but we know and you know that the suffrage is taken away from Washington because 90,000 colored people had crowded in there. And it was done by the same Republican Congress that put negro suffrage upon South Carolina and Louisiana. They did not want it there. You cannot get it there. That is the reason why Washington could not legislate at all—there are 90,000 colored men there, and that city is absolutely in the control of the Federal Congress and always has been. There are a good many people who do not approve this policy as to our national capital, and I like a man who follows his principle even if it leads over a precipice. I like New England. It has always had its convictions. But you have not many Conferences in your connection over which a colored bishop could preside. I say that if drawing the color line is wrong then the wrong consists, not in drawing it here or there, but in drawing it at all. If you are going to object to it and say it shall not be, then say it outright. But your Discipline is seamed with the color line from beginning to end more than ours. Have you not colored Conferences?

Bishop Hamilton: Yes, but they all agreed to it.

Bishop Hoss: Yes, and I know how they agreed to it. And our colored men agreed to it. You would have the same difficulty that we have if you had the same number of colored people to deal with. It is not a theory with us; it is a condition. We have 10,000,000 of them. I do not know any well-bred Southern man that has any ill will toward the negro. The people in the South who love the negro best to this day are the old masters and their descendants, who know what the good traits of the negro are. Some of us have distinct and shadowy memories as sacred as life itself. I do not forget that my mother taught me never to be rude to a colored person, and I have never spoken a rude word to one in my life. To the credit of my colored brethren, I have never had a rude word from any one of them. Now, you have the color line too. You have it in your episcopacy. I was at Cleveland when the first man was nominated and got the large vote for the episcopacy. I was sitting between two very fine ladies. Dr. Buckley brought in the report, saying that the time had probably come when one or two representatives of the colored race ought to be chosen to the office of the episcopacy. "Do not misunderstand me," he said. "I think I know some colored men entirely fit for this office. I do not mean that I do not know some white men more fit for it." Six or eight colored men in succession spoke on that point, but no white man spoke at all. A lady said: "Is it not wonderful that these men, so recently in slavery, should get

the amount of applause these people are getting?" I said: They are not going to give them anything else, and they are giving them lots of applause as a substitute." I have repeatedly since then seen them voted up within sight of an election and then voted down after they had fulfilled their function of helping put in certain white candidates for the episcopacy. We all know about the entertainment given by the colored people when Dr. Newman, General Grant's pastor, was being voted for. There is just as much prejudice in the average Northern mind against full equality as there is in the average Southern mind. In Brazil I found the Secretary of our Central Brazil Conference one of the brightest men in the Conference. I confess in presiding over a foreign Conference that I always feel as if I were a sort of an intruder. They often feel as the Japanese felt toward Bishop Fowler. He said when presiding over a Japanese Conference: "If there are any of you who think you can do this business better than I am doing it, stand up." And seven Japs stood up at once. The Chinese are the best heathen on the face of the earth. They are intellectual, with many of the noblest qualities belonging to the human race. They are getting ready to manage their own affairs. You may theorize about it till doomsday, but it does not do any good. It is there; it will come out. I cannot blame them. I held things as steady as I could. I said to the Conference: "You are not quite ready yet. We still have to furnish the funds to keep this thing going. I say we ought to have the right to say something about the way they should be administered." Bishop Candler has had trouble that he could not handle in foreign Conferences. He is a more pronounced bishop of the old type. I belong to the new generation. He is not quite as conciliatory as I am. This assumption upon our part that as men, simply because we are American and white people, we have a right to control the missions that we have gathered in foreign lands is not warranted by the facts. Bishop Hamilton, I do not know what you ought to do. If I did, I would tell you. I know you would not do it. If I had a definite conviction as to the policy that you ought to adopt, I would tell you. But I do not know. I would not turn a body of people out of the Church that had been faithful and loyal simply to meet anybody's prejudice. And if this were a proposition to turn people out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, I should resent it. However, it is simply a proposition to make a new disposition of them. You speak of the "Jim Crow" car. In some ways that is a bad thing. I never use that expression. I never say "nigger" or use any offensive epithet. I was brought up better. My people were Christian people. But

that separate car law is not wholly a bad law in the South. It protects the negro against the drunken and the disorderly white man just as much as the white people against drunken and disorderly black men. No white man may go into a colored car down there. All laws depend for their value upon the way in which they are administered. We have a great many crude things due to the prejudice of the white people in the South. I know that. I am credited with being a reasonably strong Southerner, and I shall not seriously object if my habitation on Mount Zion has a Southern exposure. But I see the faults of the Southern people more clearly than Bishop Hamilton sees them. My heart has been broken over it. I saw the South headed for destruction in my early manhood. There was a state of affairs there that would have abolished our civilization entirely. When the white people took charge of things in the South, everything improved for the colored man. We have wiped out the whisky traffic, and that was one of the best things for the colored man. There are vast numbers of colored people who are in favor of the whisky traffic. There were 3,900 of them out of 4,500 in a certain city that voted straight for the whisky democracy. I do not know whether my Brother Hamilton will believe it or not. I am credited with being a reasonably strong Democrat, but I have not voted for a Democratic Governor in Tennessee in twenty years. Judge Reeves has the same record. We decline to vote for the whisky democracy in that State. I would cross over any political lines where a moral issue is involved. One of the noblest men we ever had in the South was Charles B. Galloway. I did not always agree with him; but if there was any man in the South a friend to the colored people since the Civil War, it was Charles B. Galloway. The poorest and humblest negro in Mississippi found a friend in him. He did not know how to be insolent to anybody. He thought it was not only unchristian but indecent to treat a man unkindly because he was in lowly estate. I think if he had lived in Boston he might have been more pronounced in some views even than Bishop Hamilton. If you are going to magnify the impropriety of drawing the color line, you must take it out of your Discipline; you must abolish the colored Conferences. What more wrong is there in a colored General Conference than in a colored Annual Conference? Show me a single white Church that has a colored pastor in your denomination or a single colored Church that has a white pastor in your denomination. Colonel Reeves lives in Johnson City, in East Tennessee. Things have been mixed up there. We have a great Church in that little city, and you have. Nothing is more common than to see colored people

in the galleries of our church, but it would almost create consternation if they were thus seen in your church. The strongest Republican stronghold in the United States except the Western Reserve is East Tennessee. A congressional district in which I was brought up, after putting six or eight regiments into the Confederate army, put more regiments than any other congressional district in the United States into the Federal army. I spent three years in the Ohio Wesleyan University, but I observed that when I went there everybody except the preachers was beginning to forget the war. It is not a theory, but a fact. It is not how you would deal with a few of the colored people. After the war and after the colored people went off we had a colored sexton left in nearly every church. I knew a colored woman who positively refused to go to the colored church. She said the white people had never deserted her, and she would not desert them. There is a perfect ocean of kindness in the South toward the colored people. A well-bred Southern man always has a kindly attitude toward the colored people. Are you ready to go to the full length? [Are you ready to wipe out the color line in the Annual Conferences? I do not think you can do it. I think Almighty God has drawn the color line in indelible ink, and there ought to be no prejudice or ill feeling in connection with it.] I have studied the census for many years and looked at the color line in the light of it. About ninety per cent of the colored people in Alabama are mulatto people, and about twenty-seven per cent are such in New England. That means that a great many of those people pushed out and went North. But this proposition to solve this question by sending an equal number of colored people to the North is sheerest nonsense. All the talk about sending the colored people back to Africa is nonsense. There is no race suicide among them. God only knows what the outcome is going to be. I do not know how to solve race problems. I know how to deal kindly and in a brotherly way with my neighbor. I must treat him as a Christian man. God help you. God help us. God help us all. God save us from any hard or bitter or unbrotherly word in this matter. The question is not of turning people out of the Church or taking them into the Church. You have six or eight great States in the North that have been made Republican since the war by the colored vote, yet you never sent a colored man to Congress. New England never did. Ohio never has sent a colored man to Congress. Indiana never has, nor Illinois. The color line is drawn, so far as the offices are concerned. It is drawn at the episcopacy. I came up from New Orleans once with a lot of colored brethren to your General Conference.

They were very much excited over the question of the episcopacy. One of them said to me: "We want you to tell us if there is any constitutional reason why a colored man should not be elected bishop." I said: "None in the world. All you lack is the votes." I think a good many of them have been asked to be satisfied with the fact that there is no constitutional provision in the way. They do not get the office, and they are not going to get it. There is more prejudice in the Northern mind right now, more race prejudice, than at the close of the Civil War. The colored brethren have race prejudices just as we have. But nobody lectures them about it. African Methodist Episcopal Church and African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church! They register prejudice against the white race in the very names of their denominations.

Bishop Cooke: I would like to ask Bishop Hoss an important question: What, in your judgment, will be the attitude of the colored people to the effort of the Protestant Episcopal Church to put suffragan bishops of the colored race in their Church government?

Bishop Hoss: The negro is not going to be very much affected by that. He is not going to the Roman Catholic Church very much. He likes ceremony and show, but he wants to take a hand in it. The Baptists have got an easier way of settling that than any of us have, because they have the congregational system of Church government. There is no throwing of the two races into collision in their lawmaking bodies as with us.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair is in doubt as to what your will may be in regard to the application of the time limit.

E. B. Chappell: I suggest that we return to our law of five minutes.

F. M. Thomas: I move that after Dr. Penn and Dr. Jones have spoken, if they so desire, this rule be applied, but not until then.

By common consent this was agreed to.

I. G. Penn: I think everybody knows that I am a conservative. I have tried never to utter anything rash in the newspapers or on the platform. I have rather belonged to the school of Booker T. Washington than to any other negroes in the country. So far I have nothing harsh to say to-day and nothing bitter in my heart against anybody. I look over to those brethren who have come from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, many of whom I know personally, assuring them that I have the greatest esteem for them. I do not think there is a man among them who is not a friend of the negro. I look at Mr. Pepper and remember how he is in the hearts

of the colored people of Memphis. When that good man was ill some years ago, the colored people in his city had a certain time to pray for his recovery. There are other men here to whom I might refer. I have had great pleasure in reading the Nashville *Christian Advocate* throughout the consideration of this question, and I regard Dr. Ivey as one of the ablest religious editors in the country. I repeat that I have no prejudice or bias. I am thankful that my father and mother reared me in the Methodist Episcopal Church in contact with white people. It has given me to understand that there are good white people in this country, North and South, and that we ought to separate the white people, as the colored people, into good and bad without regard to section. When I was commissioner at the Atlanta Exposition I asked the directors to do a thing that I knew they would stop and think about seriously—namely, put Booker T. Washington on the opening program of the Exposition to make a speech representing the colored people. It was serious, because a rash word from a colored man could have brought confusion between North and South and made the Exposition absolutely a failure. [I feel that if we could have a union of the Methodisms of this country, so as to throw the heart and sympathy of Southern Methodists back of the negro, in addition to the sympathy which prevails among the Methodist people of the North, it would be the greatest thing now for the negro in this country. I came here anxious for the union of the Churches. I am willing to make any concession possible and reasonable to secure such a union. I have put myself on record as favoring a tribunal outside the General Conference. I also subscribe to what Bishop Hamilton says. If I am successful in getting to my eighth General Conference, I will subscribe to the statement that the South ought to have equal representation with us in the first General Conference of the reorganized Church. All that I am willing to concede as a Methodist Episcopalian. But when it comes to the relation of the colored people to this whole proposition, brethren, you simply face a condition and not a theory; therefore you have to deal with the facts in the case. Take my own case, for instance. I am to-day one of five generations of Methodist Episcopalians living. My grandmother, more than ninety years of age, was never anything but a Methodist Episcopalian. My mother, sixty-nine years of age, was never anything else. I am such. My daughter and my granddaughter are members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here are five generations of Methodists. We are Methodist Episcopalians with equal rights with anybody else in that Church. There are but three ways to get rid of the 340,000 other col-

ored people—die, be expelled for cause, or voluntarily withdraw. The concession in the matter of the negro and his status cannot come from the Methodist Episcopal Church. These people are members of the Church like anybody else. They know it. We are not in the Church merely for the bishopric, as has been intimated. As a race we might want such and would be proud of a bishop, but there are other considerations that bind us to the Church. The white people have not drawn the color line in the Methodist Episcopal Church without our consent. I want that distinctly understood. I have even written certain pages in the Discipline myself which drew the color line. I wrote the passage in the Discipline which provided that a colored man should be elected an Assistant Secretary of the Epworth League for colored people every four years. The colored people have colored Annual Conferences because they preferred such. All that there is in the colored line in the Church is with their consent. The colored people are perfectly willing to make any adjustment that may be necessary in the reorganized Church to have union, provided it does not deprive them of their membership in that Church. Somebody asked me: "Would you be willing to have the Synodical Conferences sit separately in the General Conference of the united Church?" I knew why that question was asked. I answered: "How could we object?" Another asked: "Would you be willing to have what Dr. Goucher suggested, the president of the General Conference elected by a vote of the bishops of the reorganized Church?" I made the same answer. But when it comes to the question of membership and the relation which the 350,000 colored people in the Methodist Episcopal Church shall sustain to the reorganized Methodist Church, our people understand that it was agreed upon by the Joint Commission at Chattanooga, made up of Southern Methodists and Northern Methodists, that we should be a jurisdiction of the united Church. The colored people are ready to be a jurisdiction of the united Church, with their own bishops and representation in the General Conference. I state what I know to be a fact, that the colored people are not ready for anything else. They reason like this: The General Conference of the reorganized Church will be a smaller body than either of the General Conferences of the two Churches as they now stand. If the General Conference of the reorganized Church equals the number of delegates in the present General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the basis upon which delegates are elected will be so high that negro representation in that General Conference will be practically cut in half.

Bishop Hoss: Do you propose to take in one and a half million of Methodists?

I. G. Penn: You need not fear the African Methodist Episcopal and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion people coming into this compact. If the 350,000 negroes of the Methodist Episcopal Church are organized outside the unified Church, you will have simply another negro Methodist Episcopal Church in America. You will never be troubled. I know you are afraid of a General Conference in the reorganized Church one-fourth of whom will be negro delegates. Primarily you have to deal here only with the 350,000 negroes who are in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Their relationship to the Methodist Episcopal Church makes them a factor in this problem. The Colored Methodist Episcopal brethren may come in, because you have some influence with them. However, I doubt that. You simply have to deal with 350,000 negroes who are in the Methodist Episcopal Church. They know their rights and privileges, how they are benefited, and how they may benefit others of their race. In closing, let me say that at the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church the bishops said in the quadrennial address the following: "In the Methodist Episcopal Church the colored members sustain precisely the same relation to the Church that the white members do. Both laymen and preachers share in all the rights and privileges, including immunities and emoluments, guaranteed any other members, and we desire and expect them to continue their membership in our Church." This has been read in almost every negro church of the Methodist Episcopal Church. When that declaration was made it settled the negro in membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Furthermore, we do not feel that, since there will be only twenty-five to forty negro delegates in the General Conference of the reorganized Church, our Southern white people ought to be afraid of contact with the few negroes who will reach the General Conference and sit with them in legislating for the Church of which they are a part.

W. N. Ainsworth: I have preserved silence in the previous sessions, not because I was without interest in the things that have been under discussion, but because I believe that the differences could be composed without difficulty on the points that we have had under discussion. But beyond a doubt we have now reached the crux in these negotiations. The Chairman of our Commission said in a fine way in the opening of these conversations in defining the limits of our authority that we desire to treat the negro in the reorganized Church in such a way as will give just recognition to race conscious-

ness, race consciousness on the side of the negro race and race consciousness on the side of the whites. It seems to me that this is fundamental, that it is absolutely essential to the largest development of the Church among both races that there shall be a full recognition of this consciousness. The family is the unit of social life. It does not promote the social life in any regard for separate families to be brought together into one family. I believe equally that it will not promote the largest development of the races on either side for us to bring the two races into one Church life, into an absolute unification of their interests. I profoundly sympathize with the brethren from the Northern side of this controversy in the condition in which they find themselves placed. We also are in a condition that is equally imperative. I pray God that we may find some basis for the reconciliation of all these divergent conditions. May God's good Spirit guide us to that common ground! I wish, in recognition of the broad principle which I have just suggested, to submit this general proposition: Let the negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and such other negro Methodists as may elect to take a place in the reorganized Church be constituted into a jurisdiction to be known as the Afro-American Jurisdiction of the unified Church, the said jurisdiction to have the same articles of faith, conditions of membership, hymnal, catechism, and ritual as shall be promulgated by the General Conference for the other jurisdictions. In view of the missionary character of the work that is now done among this race and that must be done in a yet larger way by the unified Church if we are to discharge the responsibility imposed upon American Methodism in the providence of God, let this jurisdiction be known as a missionary jurisdiction, over which the Home Mission Board of the unified Church shall have a general supervision, under such regulations as will give to the Regional Conference of this jurisdiction a large degree of autonomy in the administration of its own affairs and the working out of its own racial consciousness and solidarity. Let this jurisdiction be empowered with final authority to elect its own bishops and other officers without confirmation of the General Conference or other direct participation in its proceedings. I submit, Mr. Chairman and brethren, that the intent of this proposition is this: That we shall recognize the race consciousness that is involved, but shall at the same time furnish to our colored brethren the largest counsel and the widest brotherly assistance in working out their highest Christian destiny and also secure to them the largest liberty in the management of their own ecclesiastical affairs.

Bishop Leete: I will stand for the first part of that proposition. My own conviction is that we are wholly sincere in our desire to get to such a solution of our present difficulties as may show us the way out of our whole problem. But I cannot help feeling, and I feel that I ought to state this, that we may perhaps be erring in attempting to anticipate all the leadings of the providence of God. I am inclined to believe that, everything considered, we are not as far apart as we seem. Even Bishop Hamilton and Bishop Hoss are not as far apart as we think and perhaps not as far apart as they think. Dr. Penn has given us an admirable statement of what he thinks the negro thinks. Dr. Penn is a highly intelligent and thoroughly educated representative of his race, a man who, therefore, because of that fact and because of his constant association with white people, is perhaps a little in advance of his folk in some respects, more so than he may be conscious of. I say that to his praise and not to his discredit or the discredit of anything he may have said. I am not sure that his people will be content with all that he thinks they will be content with. That is what I am coming to. I have this feeling with reference to the suggestion just made by Dr. Ainsworth: that there is not in that so much that is terrible, unless it be the phraseology. I do not want any part of Methodism to become a missionary part. I am tired of the word "missions," anyway. It hurts the conscious self-respect of a man to be considered a subject for missions. This is true of Europe, China, and Japan. And then there is the overlordship there. That is not exactly what you or we or anybody wants—to put anything over anybody else. My own position is this: that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church is not satisfied with the present condition. Dr. Jones knows that that is so. Dr. Penn knows that that is so. Bishop Hoss is absolutely right in saying that that is so; right in this, too, that we are not satisfied with the work we have done for the negro. But we are satisfied that we have done some work for the negro. I thank God for that. I have just made in behalf of Chaflin College a tour of South Carolina, where the colored people put up \$8,000 spot cash for that institution. Their greatest problem is no longer money. There were twelve Southern Methodist ministers who met with us on that trip, every one of whom gave to Chaflin College. I know the attitude taken by those good brothers. I know what they said privately and what they think about the work our Church has done in the last fifty years. They said perhaps stronger things in its praise than I would have said, though I was partly raised in South Carolina and love the old Palmetto State. We are not satisfied with what we have

done for the negro, and he is not satisfied with what we have done for him. The negro wants the administration of the man of his own color and ought to have it just as soon as it seems possible in the wisdom of the Church to grant it. You may talk about it all you please. Paternalism never developed a race. It must grow from within its own consciousness, or there is no real progress. We have before us facts and historical conditions. I want to say to the brothers of the other side that we are all working at the same task and want to help our colored brother to stand, but we do not want to do for our colored brother simply what we think is best for him; we want him to think as we think. Even the wisest position we do not want to take by force; we want to do it by love. We want to assist the negro to do what ought to be done and as it ought to be done. We have made two mighty concessions here. As one brought up in the South, with ancestry going back three hundred years in America, I can trust my brothers in the South. I am not afraid to have an equal number of Southern delegates in the General Conference. There are no real sectional divisions any longer. I am willing, if you want to speak of North and of South, to have an equal number of delegates from each. I am not afraid about a Judicial Conference. These are great concessions in the thinking of our Church. Now I would, as we are asking our brothers to come in with equal powers, authority, and privilege, that they would let us commence where we are and not turn anybody out and not force anybody's judgment. And just as sure as Dr. Jones knows his people, and I have come to know something of them, when we are willing to set them up rationally and give them a leadership of their own and a properly affiliated jurisdiction—not as a missionary jurisdiction, but as an affiliated Church with full autonomy—you will not find our colored friends hesitating long about that matter. The Lord and our colored brethren within five years would have that matter all settled. That is a bogey. Somebody said that is our *pièce de résistance*. No. If unification comes right and you give a little time for our colored brothers to have what they want, we shall all be in the right relations to each other and to those proper distinctions which God has made and which we have to face.

At this point a recess of ten minutes was taken. Bishop Cranston, who had vacated the chair a few minutes before recess, resumed it and at twelve o'clock called the meeting to order. The Commission united in a hymn, "O to Grace How Great a Debtor."

R. E. Jones: Mr. Chairman and brethren, when I came into the room on Friday morning in the First Church and

saw you brothers sitting together, tears came into my eyes, and I offered a prayer then to the good Father that we might have union of the Methodist forces in America. That is absolutely honest and sincere. I have given a long deliverance on this whole question which is found in the volume, "A Working Conference on the Union of Methodism." This address gives somewhat in detail what I might have to say if I had time. I think my Evanston address expresses somewhat the conviction of our people. Brothers, I am in the spirit of the meeting, and I am as anxious for the union of the Methodisms in America as any other man who is in this room. I will go farther. I said in my Evanston speech that, while the negro was in a large measure the occasion of the separation, he would go one step farther than any man or group of men in making concessions that might make for reconciliation. That holds good to-day. You expect me to enter into the spirit of the meeting, and I do. You do not want me, however, to do anything that would reflect upon my self-respect, my place in the kingdom of humanity, and my divine right in the kingdom of God. I have laid down these principles. Let me say that I am a Southerner, born in the South, trained in the South. I never went a day to school outside the South. I know the South. I appreciate every position that any Southern man can take. I know your feelings. Now, speaking as a Southerner, Southern born and Southern reared, and living in the atmosphere of the South, I say to you that I do not think the situation is hopeless. I have not any horns that cannot be taken off. But, speaking as I do, thoroughly familiar with the whole situation, I believe we can get together on this question. Listen a minute. Dr. DuBose suggested the union of the negroes in our Church and another body of negro Methodists. In the first place, brothers, that is not under consideration. In the next place, that is not possible. If there is to be a marriage between the negroes in the Methodist Church and another body of Methodists, we are both going to do the courting and the selecting. Dr. Moore said that there ought to be a union of all the negro Methodists. You do not know what an impossible task that is, what a difficult task it is. I do not believe at all that if we set up a program here by which we retain our relation to the Church we shall have any trouble with the other negro Methodists. I wish, for their good and for the common good, that it were possible for us to reach them so that we might influence them. But I do not believe it is at all possible. I think we have a fine program already in operation which should facilitate organic union. What have we in the Methodist Episcopal Church? Bishop Hoss has referred to the

color line. It is in the Methodist Episcopal Church. But that should be an advantage, the start, for organic union. We have negro Conferences in the South and the Conferences in the South among white people. I do not know a single instance where a negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church has intruded upon a white Conference in the South of the Methodist Episcopal Church or a local congregation in any way that would give offense to even the ultra-South. Personally, I have never visited a Conference among our white people in the South. I have been to Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Now, there is a delicate situation which perhaps some of our friends do not quite understand. I would not freely invite a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, a white man, to do what I would insist on Dr. Moore's doing. One of my best friends in the South was Dr. John A. Rice. I would go to him any time and ask him to speak to colored people. We understood each other. He came. We had great times together. I think the very fact that the 350,000 negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church have occupied the delicate relation that they have during all these years and yet there has been no upheaval, no friction between our white Methodists in the South and the negroes in the South, at least gives a suggestion that we have a working basis. Now, what do we want? When the Federal Council met in 1911 in Chattanooga (and I think Bishop Denny was a member of that Council and signed the tentative agreement which all understood was thoroughly suggestive) one of the items was that the negroes be constituted into a separate jurisdiction. We went ahead of our Church, and I think somewhat embarrassed the Church, when a number of representative negroes met in Nashville doing what we thought would aid union, and approved in advance, so far as we were concerned, this jurisdictional idea. Of our own accord we said that we were perfectly willing that there should be a jurisdiction embracing all the colored Conferences. Bishop Leete, I think, struck a very vital point when he expressed the conviction that we do not desire a missionary jurisdiction. Do you know that we have four colored Conferences to-day that are among the contributing Conferences of Methodism? They pay all their running expenses and four or five thousand dollars to the great missionary propaganda of the Church. Those Conferences would not be willing to be constituted a part of a missionary jurisdiction. The negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church are paying to-day practically every item of expense of our work in Liberia. I think you may eliminate the bishop's salary, but I am sure we are paying the entire budget as appropriated

by our Board of Foreign Missions. Enough collections come from our colored Conferences to pay that budget. We have grown. I want to throw another bouquet at ourselves. If I have made a mistake, Bishop Hoss, I have done so repeatedly, for I have said in my paper again and again that you said the finest negro membership in the South for intelligence, for morality, and for discipline was the negro membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I think that is true, with an apology for saying it myself, being one of the number. The work the Methodist Episcopal Church has done for the negro is one of the brightest pages in the history of missions. I want a union of Methodism, and I want you men interested in the problem of the South for the sake of the negro. It is absolutely easy for us to go off and start a new Church. We would be bishops. Penn would be something. I would be something. That is easy. That is a dead shot. I know that. I know more. I know that in our relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church as it now stands there is no chance for a negro to be a general superintendent. You think we are fooled on that question. We are not. We have never asked that a negro bishop preside over a white Conference. We have never suggested anything but that a negro bishop preside over colored Conferences.

Bishop Hoss: Would not that be drawing a color line?

R. E. Jones: I believe in a color line; I do not have any fears about that. There is nothing there that I am afraid of. I do not worry about your color line or any color line. The truth is, I have felt more at home among colored people than with white folks. Southern people can understand that. Now, what do we want? We have in the South white Conferences and colored Conferences already working side by side. We affiliate more with you Southern men than we do with our white preachers. Mr. Pepper has been in a Sunday school institute conducted by myself in the city of Memphis. I have been just a little bit grieved that there seem to be points of difference that cannot be settled. I think the relation of the races is a delicate matter and the crux of the whole situation, but I think that with what we have done and with what we may do we can get along. We want a jurisdiction, but we want it because of its homogeneity of interests and environment. All that you can say for your section of country we can say from a racial standpoint. Everything you may say about a community of interests, about provincial traditions, about getting together we say it all concerning ourselves. Then we would have a jurisdiction. What do we ask you brethren of the South to concede to us, if you call it a concession? We are willing that you shall elect the presi-

dency of the General Conference in such manner as may safeguard your convictions in that matter. You have a majority of the men. You know, brethren—let me speak frankly—that if I were a white man I would never worry about negro domination when there were fifteen white men and only five negroes. If you have thirty-five bishops and we have five bishops, and we leave it to the forty bishops to elect the president of the General Conference and you elect a negro, it is your fault and not ours. We ask that you do not write into the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church anything that savors of caste. You will not do in the Methodist Church what you refuse to do in the nation. You do not ask me to agree to a caste proposition this morning when the Chief Justice of the United States, a man who fought on the side of the Confederacy, who is thoroughly orthodox from the Southern standpoint on the race question, declares, as he did the other day, the Fifteenth Amendment constitutional. Brethren, I am an American citizen through and through. I vote in Louisiana. I voted the Democratic ticket the other day for the Governor of the State. I want to say, however, that I did not vote the Democratic ticket on national issues. We want nothing in the constitution of the Church that says that a man, because of his race and color, shall not have such and such privileges. We are willing to abide God's time on that question. On the other hand, if you are going to have laws to govern the body—now I speak with utter frankness and in absolute love; I would not say a word that would give offense even to the prejudices of any man—if you are going to have laws to govern a body and laws to govern our jurisdiction—and I say this because I believe absolutely in democracy—then you must give us our ratio in the body that governs that jurisdiction. Am I speaking too much, that you shall give us a seat in that general body? Is that anything unusual? We are coming together in the South in the Sociological Congress and other bodies. We Southern white folks and colored folks are not so afraid of each other as you think we are. We are coming together. If you are afraid of the matter of seating in the General Conference, let us seat ourselves by jurisdiction. You can seat the negroes anywhere you may please in the General Conference provided it is done by lot, each section taking its chances. That is all we ask. Now, brothers, finally, I am anxious to-day for union—God knows I am—and I do not want to be the goat. I do not want to be the cause of you brethren never coming together. If I knew the mind of the Master, I would carry out that mind. We have had enough friction. I have suffered enough personally, and my race has suffered enough. I am willing right here, in

Jesus's name and for his sake, to do absolutely anything that any honest, square, upright man can ask me to do. We are not deliberating for a social club. No man has ever had any trouble with me on social lines. You have not had any trouble with me in social lines. You have not had any trouble with us here. But we are not operating a social club. We are operating a Church of Jesus Christ. I am a sinner saved by grace, and I need the gospel. When you were talking the other day about a national Church, a Church on race lines, my heart began to go down, for I was one of a thousand negroes in New Orleans when we gave an ovation to Bishop Lambuth, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He came to one our Conferences to tell the story of his going into Africa. How we did shout and sing and praise! What was his story? He told of one John Wesley Gilbert and of how a Southern white man trained him and helped him to get an education and then sent that negro to Athens to study Greek.

Bishop Candler: Gilbert won a scholarship that sent him to Greece.

R. E. Jones: At any rate, the Southern white people took great interest in Gilbert. Bishop Lambuth and John Wesley Gilbert went hand in hand into the heart of Africa to establish a mission in the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I thought I saw in the address of Bishop Lambuth and the occasion to which I refer the coming of the worldwide Church. I wrote an editorial on this. You cannot do missionary work in Africa and leave the negro to himself in the South. I am speaking as a negro to Southern white men with absolute deference to you. I want you to have a hand in saving the negroes of the South for the sake of the negro. Somebody is going to do it. The Roman Catholic Church has come into New Orleans in the last year in such a way as would astonish you. They have almost unlimited money. Mother Drexel has brought from Philadelphia twenty-five of the best women that she could get in her order of sisterhood, and they are doing that work. I have never known anything taught in any of the schools in the South by one of these men or women who came from the North to which you could really object from a Southern standpoint. They have given us an education and taught us the gospel and how to pray, and I think we are all the better citizens for their work. Don't you feel that the movement is going to break to pieces. It is not going to break to pieces as far as I am concerned. I am going to pray in Jesus's name that we shall come together and have one great, strong Church. You are dealing

primarily with 350,000 negroes in the Church. We have our constitutional rights, but no more in the Methodist Church than in the nation. You are not going to ask us to relinquish our constitutional rights of membership or of ratio of representation in the General Conference. Aside from that, we will show you that we are sweet enough and Christian enough and gentlemanly enough to abide in one Church in such a way as will be best for the kingdom of God. I hope in his Spirit and in his name we shall go forward to-day. If you will receive it at some time, I will present the entire paper which I delivered at Evanston. One more minute, and I shall be through. [At this point the time of the session was extended.] I reproduce the paper in the *Southwestern* this week, a paper that appeared in the *Epworth Era*, which is advanced thought from the Southern standpoint on the negro question. But it is Southern thought, nevertheless. I propose to keep up with the advance of thought. There is not anything in that paper that I will not subscribe to. There is not anything that will not constitute a program on which we may work. I work with the advance thought in the South, the new and better South and not an ultra-South. The next forward step in the uplift of the negro is to be made by Southern white men. I had hoped that here that forward step would be taken by these men. You are big enough and have social prestige enough to do anything you want for the negro.

E. C. Reeves secured the floor.

A. J. Lamar: I move that we continue the discussion of this subject when we come together this afternoon at 2:30 and that Colonel Reeves have the floor at that time.

The session adjourned at 12:35 P.M. with prayer, and the benediction pronounced by Bishop Cranston.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

At 2:45 P.M. Bishop Cranston called the meeting to order.

The roll was called, and the following Commissioners were present: Bishops, E. E. Hoss, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke; ministers, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace; laymen, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A.

W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, I. E. Robinson, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., R. V. Watt.

A statement concerning the proposed Francis Asbury statue, to be erected in the city of Washington, was made by Dr. Watson, the chairman of the committee having that matter in charge. The architect, Mr. Lukeman, also made certain statements with reference to it, answered questions, and replied to certain criticisms.

J. H. Reynolds offered prayer.

The journal of the morning session was read by Secretary Thomas and, with slight corrections, was approved.

Bishop Candler took the chair.

At this point and also later in the session Secretary Thomas and Secretary Harris announced a large number of telegrams received from various individuals and from various bodies of Methodists in diverse sections of the country, all urging that real progress be made toward unification.

Bishop Cranston made a statement concerning the proposed call by the Joint Commission upon President Wilson. Inasmuch as it appeared that such a call could not be made consistently with due attention to the business of the Commission, Dr. Downey suggested that Bishop Cranston be requested to express to President Wilson the pleasure of the Commission at his willingness to receive them and to explain that the pressure of work would make the pilgrimage at this time practically out of the question. Bishop Cranston suggested that it be left to him to make such answer as the condition of business might seem to warrant, and this was the disposition finally made of the matter.

E. C. Reeves: I have no set speech. A lawyer seldom has. He learns to think on his feet. I certainly have no prejudice in the world against the negro. I was born among them. I was carried around by them when I could not walk. I was raised with them. I worked in the fields with them. My father required me to do as much work as any slave he owned. I had a black mammy. I had a negro boy who was with me during the war, who was as true to me as man could be to man. In the South, when our mothers and wives and sisters and daughters were at the mercy of this race, there never was an outrage known during the war. How could I dislike such a race as that? I have an affection for them. At the same time I must recognize the social condition that exists. One of the speakers—I believe it was Bishop Hamilton—said we had to look at this question from the standpoint of the negro. Why certainly that is true. But the Bishop was almost too circumscribed. He was looking at it, taking in 350,000 negroes and leaving out about a million and

a half of whom he did not speak. We must take a broader view of this question. If we can reach a conclusion here that will set off the whites into one unified Church and eventually Methodist negroes of the United States into another, why, then, the greatest work that has ever been done in Protestantism will have been done. Can we do it? That is the question. I wish now to read what the late Dr. A. B. Leonard said: "The negro was the sole cause of the division that was precipitated in 1844, and to-day he is the one obstruction to reunion. Eliminate the negro, and the two Methodisms will flow together as naturally as two rivers unite and flow on in the same channel." But he says that cannot be done. Can it be done? That is the question before us here and now. It will be sad indeed, after we have come here and have learned to love each other as we have, if we go away without accomplishing any good. I will feel sad. But yet I am frank to say that I was a pessimist. I started out opposed to this whole thing. I wrote against it. My Church moved in the other direction and declared for unification. By the goodness and courtesy of some brethren on the appointing committee I was placed on this committee. I determined either not to take my position as a committeeman or else not to be an obstructionist, and so I came up here to help find the way, if there be a way, for organic union. I do not understand this unification by the method of reorganization. That term was used by our General Conference and by the General Conference at Saratoga Springs. There is no such thing as unification by the method of reorganization. There can be no such thing. Unification is the making of a single unit out of two or more units. The old units die, are lost in the creation of a new unit. Reorganization is simply a rearrangement of what is already in being. [Here the gavel fell.]

Bishop McDowell: I rise simply to say that I should be very glad if I might be permitted as a special courtesy, in case it is needed, to complete the small statement I have to make, though it take a minute or two beyond the allotted time. I rise simply to say a word or two which I hope may help to clarify for the present and for the future what is now before us and other matters that will be before us as well. First, I think, whatever happens or does not happen, we are all thankful to God Almighty for his presence during the discussion this afternoon. If anybody had said ten years ago that this kind of a discussion could have taken place in a body made up as this is and be participated in as this discussion was, he would have been told that he was a vain dreamer. That is first. We thank God for the spirit in which the discussion has gone forward up to this time. Secondly, I think it is

now perfectly clean to our minds that the problem before us—namely, the status of the negro, not simply the status of these 350,000 of our negroes, but the status of the negro in the united Church—is a problem for all of us and not simply for some of us. It is a problem for our Church; it is a problem for your Church; it is a problem for the white and for the negro race. It is our problem. Under God we must solve it if we can. We do not well, therefore, to toss it back and forth between us or (to use the phrase sometimes used in the street) for either of us to "put up to" the other and hold the other responsible for its solution. We do well in the spirit of our common Lord and Master to seek to find a common and Christian way through this matter, which is ours. It seems to me, further, that the basis upon which we must determine this may lie along the following principles: First, of course, what is right. For what is right will be wise. What is wrong cannot be wise. We cannot get the discussion off the high level. Nobody wants to get the discussion off the high level of what is right. Therefore we must hold to that high basis, considering the question for the Church of Jesus Christ. Further, we have to consider it in the light of the question: "What will give us as a united Methodism the best and most vital point of contact with the largest and most significant missionary problem existing within the republic?" It is not primarily the question of our relation to these 350,000 negroes, but primarily for us all the question is one of the best point of contact. I do not say what is the best point of contact. But we must find the best point of contact for that real helpfulness and service in Christ's name that will be best for us all. We cannot do a thing, for instance, and ask God's blessing upon it that is going to cut us off from our opportunity to bless the world and the kingdom through what we do in and through the negro race. And I go so far as to say that I can appreciate the fact that the Northern view of the negro is probably a partial view. We do not know the negro as well as you do. I would go far enough to say that I think the Northern view of the negro is not wholly wrong, nor do I think yours is wholly right. I believe that in this great matter neither of us can do the thing alone. [Time expired.] Neither of us can do that great thing alone. We are face to face in this, as in many other matters, with the question not of what a single body can accomplish, but with the question whether a united body can do what needs to be done. It is true on the foreign field; it is true on the home field. We must not, therefore, cut the point of contact that will enable us to do our greatest work in the greatest missionary field (I am using that word not

invidiously at all), to perform the largest helpfulness to the most distinct group of people within the republic. Now, practically, here are two or three questions that must be considered in the solution of the problem. First, what plan can we get through this Commission with substantial unanimity? For, believe me, in the vital matters that were under discussion Saturday and that are under discussion now any one of these things that goes through this Commission by a hairbreadth majority is not receiving what it must have in order to be effective as an agency for unification. Is not that true? If anything carries by a majority clear and distinct in one of the Commissions and barely carries in the other, it ought to give us pause. Secondly, on this point: We have to consider what, after it has gone through this Commission, we can carry through the Churches. And that is even a good deal more serious. The Churches are not here. They have not felt this spirit. They not heard these discussions. Some of them do not more than half believe in unification, anyhow. Some of them believe that we are doing as well as we could expect to. A plan might easily go through the Commission and be wrecked in the Churches. We have to consider, therefore, the making of a plan that we can carry through the Churches, and in putting the thing through the Churches we must hold the confidence of three bodies. We must hold the confidence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that in this particular item we are not flouting and disregarding or cutting across their convictions and conditions. Brothers, if the prophecy that has been made that a certain kind of union would cause the immediate loss of twenty per cent of your membership is true, nothing could induce me to favor a plan that would cause such a defection among you. That would be too big a price for us to pay. Now, it has been said that this defection might be from one of two sources. It has been said that it might be from two, the unthinking and backward among you who would be moved according to their irrational prejudices; and, on the other hand, it has been said that if we adopt a certain kind of union it will cause the loss of 500,000 of your best people. Brethren, we never can afford to lose either extreme from the Church of Jesus Christ. We cannot be indifferent to those that are most backward or to those that are most advanced. Therefore we have in this plan to conserve the really best spirit, the spirit of Jesus Christ, in so far as that spirit obtains among our Southern brethren on this subject. And we must not make a plan that will be beaten in the Church because of the conviction outside this Commission that the plan is cutting across the convictions of the Church. Of course, also, we must hold the confi-

dence of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that it shall be sure that in this plan of unification we are not abandoning any principle or any spirit of a half century. You would not ask us to do that, not for one minute. I know you perfectly well at that point. Nobody here wants anybody else to concede a sacred principle. The only concession that anybody asks anybody else to make here is concession at points of opinion that do not contravene or cut across principles that either of the great bodies holds dear. In the next place, we must hold the confidence not only of the negro brethren who belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church, but of that small group in such fashion as to send a thrill of hope that they are to be helped along the way of self-development and progress, a thrill of hope through that great body of negro life in America and Africa which the Protestant Church must lead or lose. With these principles, Mr. President and brethren—and I thank you more than I can tell for permitting me to say them through—with these principles it seems to me that we ought before we have finished to appoint a strong standing committee, not in hopelessness, not in despair, not with a sense that it cannot be done, but with hope, hope that I did not feel yesterday, with confidence that I did not have yesterday, confidence that has been mightily increased during this day, a strong committee to which with confidence and with hope we shall commit all the documents that are in existence, official and unofficial, touching this matter, to which committee we shall commit the speeches that were this morning made upon this subject and to which committee, let us hope, under God may be sent the spirit in which this discussion went forward to-day, that committee to work on these principles in the endeavor to reach that kind of plan that would not only carry through the Commission itself, but carry through the Churches and have the abiding favor of the Lord God Almighty. For we are face to face not with the simple question of whether we can or cannot get together. We are face to face with that question and face to face with it as it affects one of the largest missionary questions that ever confronted a great Church. No other body ought to have the hold upon the negro at home and abroad that the Methodist Church has or should have. Heaven help us! Mr. Chairman, I offer that, not by way of motion, but as such small contribution as I have to this question. I do not pretend to say what plan must be adopted. I only try to say what sort of principles must be conserved in the creation and adoption of the plan. And I am just as sure as I am of anything that we ought not now to vote upon anything except

the creation of such a committee and have that act in such a spirit as that.

E. B. Chappell: I like that part of Bishop McDowell's speech in which he pleads for the larger vision. We have discussed this matter largely as if there were only two Churches interested in this unification question, the Methodist Episcopal and the Methodist Episcopal, South. Under the original action that we adopted at Oklahoma City and that was subsequently adopted at Saratoga we look out farther than that. That plan took into consideration such other branches of the negro Methodism of America as might desire to join in the negotiations. Some of the speeches made here this morning assumed that those negro Methodist bodies have no interest in this matter and probably would not consent to come into our negotiations at all. But how do we know? We have not approached these negroes. As a matter of course, their self-respect is not going to permit them to come and ask if they may be permitted to come into our deliberations and see if some plan cannot be worked out that is large enough to comprehend in its scope all negro Methodists in America. In other words, I think we ought to plan largely and maybe plan for a little longer time than we have had in mind, not being too hasty. Perhaps, if you will think about what I am trying to say, you will see how this view throws light on the things that were said by some of the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, this morning. We want to lay plans for the helping of all these negro Methodists and through them of all the negroes in the United States. Some things that have been proposed at once become impossible when we take this larger view of the task before us. I have been thinking about what some of our brethren have said about the impossibility of putting the colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church out. As a matter of course, no one of us ever thought of asking our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church to do any such thing. But we have thought that perhaps in planning for the larger interests of American Methodism, both white and colored, there might come a day when in our deliberations our colored brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church would see that it was best for them to become the nucleus of a great organization of colored Methodists that should be vitally related to us and yet might be left free to work out their own racial destiny in their own way.

T. N. Ivey: I have only a few words to say. We have approached a stage in these proceedings where there seems to be presented to us that which is disappointing. But I wish to say that I have no feeling of that kind whatever. I be-

lieve that the only doubtful element in this whole question is the time element, and that as truly as God reigns and as surely as he will conduct his Church to a successful goal, just so certainly shall we see unification of the Methodisms accomplished. I wish to say, however, that I desire to go on record as believing that all that has been said by our Northern brethren on this question this morning is utterly sincere. I wish them to know that we appreciate the fact that they are facing a very serious condition. I wish them to know that we recognize the fact that they have a twofold difficulty, so to speak. It is impossible for them to intimate by a single word that they desire these colored brethren to solve the difficulty by removing themselves. I believe, my brethren of the Northern Methodist Church, that you feel you have a great moral and spiritual duty which you have not yet accomplished with respect to them. There is not a man on this Commission who does not thoroughly realize that fact. At the same time I would not have any one of my Northern brethren to leave the meeting to-day, much less leave Baltimore, with the idea that we of the South do not have the same difficulty before us. We face a situation, a condition—a condition which is as imperious as empire itself, a condition which has all the opacity and hardness of a stone wall, a condition brought about by a public sentiment hardened through years of history and based firmly on tradition. It is a sentiment which is perfectly willing to say to us, "Reorganize Methodism and give the negro a vital opportunity," which is willing to have the colored element in our Annual Conferences, which is willing to have a colored jurisdiction, but, nevertheless, a sentiment which says (we shall not here go into argument as to whether it is right or wrong) that there cannot be in our lawmaking bodies that element which is not allowed in a single Southern State in our legislatures or in the Congress of the United States. These are very frank words. There is not a single Southern State that would keep in power a legislature composed partly of our colored brethren. There is not a single Southern State that would keep in Congress our colored brethren. I am not saying anything about the moral nature of that sentiment, but it is the fact. We would find the same sentiment staring us in the face in forming a General Conference of such nature as that our people would be privileged to say: "Our laws are being made by the colored brethren." I do not believe that our Southern people would refrain from giving us trouble on that very point. At the same time, with all that is before us, my faith in God is strong enough to make me believe that we *can* do our duty to the unified Methodism, that we *can* do our duty

to our colored brethren, that we *can* make them a vital part of our Church, and at the same time please both North and South and, above all things, please God himself. Those are very frank words, and I felt that they should be spoken in all love and candor at this important juncture, with the full understanding that in all our negotiations in determining the place of the colored membership in the reorganized Church we are guided only by the consideration of what is the highest good to the greatest number of the negro race. [Following this rule, I can see nothing but an independent relation for the negro or an organic relation free from the legislative function in the highest lawmaking body of the reorganized Church.]

J. W. Van Cleve: My brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church will all bear testimony that I am by nature a rather timid and fearful man. I am more afraid of some things than of others. One of the things that I am a little afraid of here is that quite frequently we shall consider this question from the viewpoint of how we can get the negro out of the way so that we can get together. I do not believe that the problem can be solved in that way. I do not believe that there are two or three different paths by which we can get by this question. After all, the big question that we have to consider is not how we may put the negro in such position as will enable us to have a unified Church, but how we can so adjust ourselves to the negro as to solve this tremendous problem of our civilization. I do not think that we are in a position to discuss very rationally, and certainly by no means finally, the place of the negro in the reorganized Church until we have first of all discussed what kind of a constructive program we can get together on for the solution of this problem of the negro himself. Much stress was laid this morning on the fact, asserted and conceded, that we have done something for the negro in the South. But I would remind you of this other fact: that what we have done for him in the South we have done under a tremendous handicap. I am absolutely sure that there is only one final solution to this negro question, and that is not in finding a place ecclesiastical for the negro, but in finding a policy upon which we can get together and put the whole power of the white Methodism in this nation at the task of solving that problem. We have had all the time to reach over the heads of the white environment of the negro to help them. We have not been able to get the purchase we needed. I do not think we can solve that problem by that process ever on earth. I do believe, I would like to be confirmed in the belief, that we have made the best progress toward the civilization and Christianization of the

negro in America that has been made yet. We have worked on the outside. But if we can find a plan by which the men who are closest of all to the negro, who understand him best and are best understood by him, will heartily approve of and coöperate in this business, we shall have gone very far. So I think the wisest thing before us is the proposition of Bishop McDowell. If we can have a committee so constituted not superficially, but carefully and constructively, to consider all that has been done for the negro and how it has been and what can be done and come before this body and before the Church, North and South, with a great, comprehensive declaration of what ought to be done and of how the conditions can be met, I think we shall make more progress than can otherwise be made. I would rather wait twenty years to solve this problem if necessary. But I believe we could leave the question to such a committee and find a way.

A. F. Watkins: I wish, first of all, to say that I indorse most heartily both the wisdom and good spirit of the suggestion made by Bishop McDowell in reference to the committee. I would like, if it were possible, to make plain to my brethren of the North how this matter of the relation of the colored people to the Church appears to those living in the extreme South. In this I can speak with confidence, for I was born and reared in the southern portion of one of the Gulf States. I have never lived anywhere else, and from my childhood I have been saturated with the traditions of Southern Methodism. In some degree, I think, I am free from prejudice. I have been among the negroes all my life, and some of my best friends have been members of that race. I do not know when I first came to believe that it is the will of God that the Methodisms of the North and South should be united. I have believed it consistently for years. I have come here earnestly desiring that this thing should come to pass. I have no desire to see objections to union and magnify them. I wish to remove them as far as they can be removed. But I have not come with the intention of closing my eyes to real hindrances. I wish to see them, for only as they are seen and removed can this which I desire be brought about. The negroes in the South, who throng our streets and are in all our homes, are not those to whom we could safely commit the solution of the civil and religious problems that confront us. It is no reflection upon them to say that they are backward and incompetent; they are undeveloped intellectually, morally, socially, industrially. I know them. They are more numerous than white people in Mississippi. They are working the cotton fields, they are the unskilled laborers, they are workers in the humblest tasks. The negro as we

know him is not typified by Dr. Penn here or Dr. Jones. Bishop Hamilton is a type of the people among whom he lives. In the same sense it is not so with Dr. Penn. Possibly my brethren of the North do not know this. But Bishop Hamilton knows that these refined and cultured men do not typify the negro of the South. Some years ago it was my privilege and pleasure to have as a guest in my home an honored bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the session of a negro Conference over which he was presiding. One day I said to him: "Bishop, don't you think it would be best to set these brethren apart in a separate and independent Church, sustaining very close relations to the white Methodist Churches, somewhat after the plan adopted by the Southern Church in the organization of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church?" He said in reply: "When I look into the faces of these people and see their helplessness, I cannot rid myself of the thought that they need the guiding and helping hand of their white brethren." Bishop Hamilton said practically the same thing this morning, and I believe it is true. Now, all this means that the Southern negro is helpless, immature, unstable morally, insolvent financially, untutored. I am not blaming him that he is so. I may be more to blame for the facts than he. But he is the ward of the nation and the Church. Some provision must be made for him. Why may he not be set apart in a Regional Conference of the Church and yet not sustain to the General Conference of the Church the same relation as that sustained by the cultured and self-supporting Conferences of the East, the Middle West, or the white Conferences of the South. As a race he is not to-day capable of making the laws of the State or Church. He constitutes the greatest missionary field of American Methodism. That he contributes to the enterprises of the Church I have no doubt, but he is not self-supporting. Why may he not sustain to the Church the same relation as that sustained by other missionary peoples who may, in the event of the reorganization of the Church, be set apart into Regional Conferences? Is this too great a price to be paid by us, to be paid by him, for the reuniting of the severed body of American Methodism?

R. N. Snyder: I think we are getting now to put the emphasis in our thinking at the right point. For a while this morning we were, I believe, a little too narrow in our thinking. We were concerned too largely with rights and privileges of those that we have and were not thinking so much about those that we have not. I believe that it is the best for the negro himself, the mass of them outside both white Methodisms, to give him his chance at his own people in an

independent Church. I believe that not because I am so much concerned about what our Southern people will think if we allow a few colored men to go into a General Conference. I believe our people will go just as far as the reasonably unified leadership of this whole Commission will go. Wherever we go as a unit with earnestness and intelligence our people will go with us in the main. However, whenever we attach negro Methodists to white Churches we have set a barrier between them and their service to their own people. You, Dr. Penn and Dr. Jones, spoke of what the Methodist Episcopal Church has done for the negro, and the story of what this Church has done has been one of the noblest stories of American history. But you have not been able to do all that you could have done, because the negroes themselves draw caste lines among themselves. I know how they feel. To illustrate this I might quote you much they are saying about "them white folks niggers," meaning the colored people affiliated with white Churches. They feel somehow that when you have stepped away from them for any reason they also must step away from you. You are never going to get at the colored man, therefore, until the colored man himself, with the consciousness of race pride and race initiative and race idealism, turns his back on everything except the welfare of the race. I do not know whether as a colored man I could do it or not, but I know that if I did I should not seek far to find a rare romance of Christian experience and achievement. I could take you to Carolina and Mississippi and Alabama, and as a colored man working for colored men I could offer you a field that would call to your heart with such a romance of appeal as would give color to every gray and haggard day that you might have otherwise. For the sake of the negro, therefore, we have got to do something of that kind by the negro, for the negro. Now, in the next place, this is an American problem. It is not Southern; it is not Northern. It may be that we have reached the point right here where, with the passion of a great faith that desectionalizes the whole problem, all of us can do for these people something more than we have done.

W. J. Young: I want to preface what I have to say by this statement: that a large part of my ministry in very busy large city Churches has been given to personal touch with the colored people. I have found no difficulty, because I have sought them, in preaching in their churches and in rendering other services to them in religious and social and moral uplift. I believe that whatever is done by this Commission ought to be done with one purpose (and only one) in view, and that is to do what is best for the development and uplift of

the colored race. We that are strong should bear the infirmities of the weak. Paul could say that he was a debtor, because he had treasures of grace and truth that others did not have. So far as I am concerned, I have the fullest sense of this obligation, and because I feel that and have conducted my life, as far as I knew, from this point of view I want to say this: that I am convinced that your failure, so far as you have failed, in your work in the South and among the colored people—and I give all credit and all honor to what you have done—has been due to the fact that your work has been done in the face of Southern convictions upon what to us is fundamental and because you have not been willing to carry out the very program suggested of the separation of the two races. I cannot stop to illustrate that or enlarge it to any great extent; but I am convinced that it is true. Your Church—I think the facts will bear out this statement—has not been growing of recent years as other negro Methodist organizations in the South have been growing. It is because, on the one side, you have not had the thoroughgoing sympathy and support of the white people of the South. And, on the other hand, there is (what I hail with joy) a large growth of self-consciousness among the negroes which has led them to feel that they must assert their own independence and work out their own salvation. I do not believe that these two colored men beside me themselves thoroughly understand the problems of their own race. It is a peculiar fact that negroes of their type do not understand the negro of the South as thoroughly as do the white people of the South. I do not think it is going to be so hard to bring the negroes together as these two brethren state. About eighteen months ago I was present at a meeting of one hundred and twenty-five Methodist preachers, representing all branches of colored Methodism. They were about as strong colored preachers as I have ever met in any communion. I think they voted unanimously in favor of uniting all colored Methodists in one great Church. I believe that men like these colored men who sit beside me, if they had the courage or heroism to do it, could solve the problem for themselves and for the colored race by going out and being brave enough to face their brethren and to speak the truth to them as the Southern white people who love the negro understand it, thus solving the great problem that has been agitating the Churches ever since the war by bringing about the formation of the negro Methodists into an entirely separate ecclesiastical organization in sympathetic touch with their white brethren.

H. H. White: I speak with great diffidence, because my own convictions are not yet firmly fixed and for the further

reason that I feel somewhat like a novice. But, coming from the far Southern State of Louisiana, I suppose it is well for me to speak for the purpose of helping some gentlemen here to know something of conditions as they exist and of sentiment as I interpret it in that State. The relation of the races in Louisiana for the last thirty or nearly forty years has been pleasant. The colored race has made very great progress in that State. I live at the geographic center of the State, in the great Red River Valley, a sugar- and cotton-producing country. I suppose there is scarcely a more conservative place in the South. The white population is the old Southern white population. The negroes are the negroes who were born and reared there. So far as the negroes are concerned, there has been little emigration from there or immigration thereto. As an illustration of the feeling of the white people in that section of Louisiana—and I believe it is typical not only of that community, but of others similarly situated in the South—I will say this: Very recently one of the largest plantations in the environs of Alexandria, where I live, what had formerly been a great cotton plantation, was bought by a gentleman for the purpose of being divided and sold to small farmers. In the division of that place about two thousand acres were allotted for sale to white people. Some twelve hundred or fifteen hundred acres of it will be divided into five- or ten-acre tracts and sold to well-to-do colored men, many of whom have acquired property and lead respectable lives and are respected families in that community. As another illustration of the sentiment in that community, I will say that not more than a week before I left home there came into the community a gentleman representing the Baptist Missionary Society. He had to do with the removal of a university from New Orleans and its location in the country. The primary purpose of that university is to educate colored ministers and teachers, also to perform the general functions of educational institutions. He came to my office with a letter and asked me whether I thought the location of such an institution as that in the environment would be agreeable to the white people. I told him that I thought it would, that we had committed ourselves to the education of the negro race, were taxing ourselves heavily for that purpose, had recently begun the erection of a \$20,000 high-school building for them in that city, and that any institution that would educate the negroes and relieve the pressure on the public school funds would be welcome. But I said I would prefer that he appear before the Chamber of Commerce for their views. I called that body together. It was composed of men of the world, not of Methodists. Some of them were Jews, and some

were Catholics. They unanimously invited that institution to locate there and said they would welcome it. I do not know that that has much to do with the question at issue, but it illustrates the spirit. I approve in a general way the plan outlined by Bishop McDowell as I understand it and the sentiments concerning the relations of the races just expressed by Dr. Ivey.

C. M. Bishop: I hope you will not grow weary with so long a succession of Southern speakers. Brethren, I think that you will be convinced, by the fact that every man wishes to give his testimony, that the representatives of the South realize something of the seriousness of the problem that is before them. The fact is that they have long been working at the task of serving and saving the negro and of solving the race problem in their own States. True, this is an American, a national, problem, but it is peculiarly a Southern problem. It affects our social life most intimately; it has much to do with our commercial and industrial life; it has tremendous political significance. Because of the fact that the negro lives in the South, it affects us not simply as an academic sociological problem, but as a matter that touches our most intimate well-being and that of our children and the millions of both races. We are facing the problem, not afraid of it, but realizing that it must be solved. We have not been altogether negligent about it, but we have not been altogether sure about it. There is, I dare say, a course of study either in the classroom or in the college Y. M. C. A. of every Methodist college in the South which covers the social problem which the negro suggests. Textbooks are written upon it. A valuable little volume is circulated among our college students, men and women, the author of which is a Methodist preacher. And there is more than one such volume which they read and study. The youth of our section are coming to be conscious of the importance and significance of this problem, which has got to be solved and can be solved only from the Christian standpoint. Nothing less and nothing else than the principles of Christianity will overcome this deep-seated thing that we call race feeling or race prejudice. We are concerned about these things. It is a proposal which we heartily second that we help each other, that you of the North meet us of the South, familiar with the conditions that obtain there and with the negro character, giving due consideration to our standpoint, and that at the same time as Christian men and citizens of this country you contribute your aid to the solution of this problem. Coming back to the original question, let me say that a limitation has been put about the discussion which would exclude a phase of it to which I want

to give a little thought. It has been suggested that we should postpone future problems and difficulties for future consideration and deal now with the concrete situation before us, leaving the future to work itself out. I do not concur with that view. I do not think it is quite wise to try to hide from yourself what the future may either promise or threaten. I would like these brethren, who represent the colored constituency of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to imagine for themselves, and to visualize if they can, a General Conference ten years from now in the united Church in which their people would be present representing a small percentage of the membership, say one-fifth or one-tenth. How ineffective would be their work for themselves! How unsatisfactory! What little independence they would have as individuals! Still, a self-conscious group, acting together with complete solidarity, what independent contribution could they make to the legislation of that body in which they were overwhelmingly outnumbered? And would there not be danger that they be a disturbing element? The question of place and power would come up in the midst of the legislation and of the other work of the General Conference. Would not that reduce their usefulness there? Why cannot we establish a Church, including the present colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which, nevertheless, legislates completely for itself in racial sections? [Time extended.] It seems to be so simple a thing that I actually feared it might excite a smile. But I do think there is something in this. Let us have one great Methodist Church body, composed of all races, but carrying forward its life and doing its legislation in racial General Conferences. Let them meet simultaneously and at the same place. Let them have some sort of nexus binding them together and probably joint committees of consultation. I do not know any precedent. But might it not be something like the proposed League of Nations of which we hear so much? At any rate, there should be some vital organic relationship obliging us to work in the closest coöperation, but at the same time preserving for each race its own significant independence. I think we can do this without driving anybody out of the Church or erecting any wall of separation between ourselves and these brethren whom we want to serve and save and whom we want to prevent from becoming a menace to the entire civilization of our country. I think we can make such an arrangement as will keep them still in the great Methodist Episcopal Church, but allow the color line, which, as my Brother Jones suggested, runs between the Annual Conferences, to run on through the General Conference. You will have to invent some means by which you can keep these

racial General Conferences in vital connection with each other, but that is not beyond the ability of some of these ecclesiastical statesmen. It can be done in such a way as to erect these brethren into a colored Methodist Episcopal Church, which will then draw to itself a united colored Church, as we shall hope to draw to ourselves other Methodist bodies and become a united white Methodist Church. I do not think this is a mere dream or that it is too simple to have in it the suggestion of a practical solution of our difficulty.

Bishop Cranston: Somebody has made the remark that time is an element in the success of the movement that we have in hand. This forenoon I was thinking that the matter is likely to go forward more rapidly than the most sanguine of us had dared to hope. I am aware that it is difficult to change the attitude of people toward matters that affect social, religious, and industrial life. I think this question does affect us in these particulars, both North and South. And yet if ever there was a movement in which God seemed directly concerned and as to which his will has been manifested through the operation of his spirit upon the minds of men ready to listen, we are now dealing with that kind of a movement. We may recall how the suggestions of the Joint Commission at Chattanooga were apparently ignored by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Surely Bishop Denny and Bishop Hoss have had something of the same kind in their thought. I am sure I have heard them mention it, notably at the first meeting of the Joint Commission on Federation after our General Conference. It is my judgment that if that matter had been pressed upon the General Conference of 1912 the movement would have died then and there. Yet at the next General Conference, in 1916, with a tremendous enthusiasm and a unanimity born directly of the Spirit of God, the basic principles of those suggestions were adopted. My recollection is that when that meeting at Chattanooga adjourned there was hardly a man of us who had dared to pledge that he would stand before his constituency and advocate all that those suggestions contained. Behold what a transformation has occurred in the larger of these two communions in that time! I am afraid that some of us by our timidity will arrest the movement of the Spirit of God, if such a thing can be done. This is not the hour to take counsel of our fears. The time to move in a great matter like this is when God is moving. Our time is now. I am not so sanguine as to believe that we could possibly come to an agreement here as to all the details that pertain to the construction of the new constitution, but I am persuaded of the probability that any action of this Joint Commission

which may be adopted with a considerable degree of unanimity will find acceptance with our people on both sides. I believe with the brother who said a little while ago that the men in this Commission can direct the sentiment of the people at home. I am not afraid of the people at home. They are by a large majority in favor of this movement. They are tired of the old order of things. As to the practical point that we have to deal with here just now—the form the representation of the negro membership in our Church shall take in the new organization, what shall be their status—I do not see that it matters a great deal if our attitude toward the question be right. We talk about a sociological problem. It takes two factors at least to make such a problem. There is the negro with what he is on one side; on the other side the white people and what they are. I can hardly be expected that all the change necessary to adjust these two factors to each other shall take place on one part only. Both must make concessions. Our negro brethren are ready to do what is right. I believe that Bishop Leete is justified when he says, from an intimate knowledge of the colored people, that they are ready to do what is necessary in order to bring about this desirable end. I stood a few years ago on Point Inspiration, up in Yellowstone Park. I looked down into that awful chasm and saw an eagle's nest. My attention was drawn to it by a disturbance. Some one remarked: "The parent eagle is trying to dislodge the young ones from the nest." It looked cruel. But otherwise there would be no eagles in the sky. We have no disposition to dislodge our colored brethren, but they may claim the air. In the plan of Dr. Du Bose the kind of nexus is of vital moment. Is it possible through such a nexus to hold in comity the two races? We are God's children on both sides. We are recognizing it. I have heard to-day that which has thrilled me—the ready recognition on both sides of our joint duty to bring forward these people, whose misfortune it is and not their fault that they do not stand upon the same plane of intellectual development and spiritual culture with the white race. May we not fail in that holy task!

J. F. Goucher: There are two fundamental necessities in the development of mankind. First is the privilege of making one's own mistakes. Until there is self-interpretation there can be no possibility of development. If it stops short of this, it is only an abortion. There must also be the necessity of correcting one's own mistakes. When the privilege of making one's own mistakes is accompanied by the necessity of correcting one's own mistakes, you are going far toward the development of self-consciousness and self-interpretation, which are the fun-

damental elements in personality. While I do not discount in the least the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church to our colored friends, we have denied them to a large extent both this privilege and this necessity. We have not permitted them to make their own mistakes. There have been mistakes enough, far too many, but the General Conference has insisted on monopolizing this privilege. Neither have we corrected the mistakes we have made, but too often simply satisfied ourselves with going on and making other mistakes. I speak in this from the side of the colored man. I have been president of the board of trustees of a college for colored people for over thirty years and have had considerable interesting experience and have observed their development. And it is a matter of observation and my best judgment that, speaking for them, they need an autonomous existence, not outside Methodism but so related to Methodism that they may find self-interpretation at the same time they are developing self-consciousness. Otherwise, our nation is in danger, and the Church is in danger, and the colored people are absolutely in danger in all their relationships. There is one thing, however, that I do not altogether like this afternoon. I have been delighted with the spirit and with our progress psychologically. It is first the specific and afterwards the general. I do not like standing here and talking on the negro question as though that were the only question confronting the Methodist Church. This question of race consciousness, inseparable from the question of race interpretations, has been more insistent in Japan. They realized it through the organization of a Japanese Church. It is insistent in China, tremendously so. I have participated in at least four Conferences there in which they were discussing the possibility of getting together for self-government. It is emerging in India. It is becoming insistent in Latin America and elsewhere. Therefore I should like to see this question discussed on the broader plane of the fundamental principles involved and not on a particular plane, as though it applied to negroes as altogether different from the rest of humanity. I think it would be very much more desirable if we should come to the discussion of the fundamental principles. It was to that I was referring on Saturday when I said I thought there ought to be Regional Conferences, possibly for Eastern Asia and for Southern Asia and for Latin America and for Africa and the Africans, and that we should make one, or possibly two, for Europe. These are parts of the very problem we are facing here. If we discussed it on the broader basis, it would not be special legislation, not open to the suspicion of trying to force the negro out of Methodism any more than when we

sent our children from the primary to the secondary school and to college preparatory and from college to the post-graduate work. Further, the Lord Christ came in the fullness of time; time was not an element in Almighty God's relation to the advent of Jesus. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever; but time was a fundamental element in the evolution of human desire and human appreciation and human understanding. And this is the case just here. We have come in the fullness of time now to face these problems. I will make a confession because our Church has been misinterpreted. There has been a good deal of criticism that the plan of the Joint Commission adopted at Chattanooga was not presented for action before the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1912. I was one of the sub-committee of two which wrote that report for our Standing Committee. The other one wrote a paragraph presenting that plan for the action of the General Conference. When we came to compare notes, I insisted that for the present that recommendation be left out of the report. I think anybody who knows me will not write me down as belated in my interest in unification. I said to the other member of the committee: "Don't let us do anything but report the plan to our General Conference for information, because, in my judgment, our General Conference is not ready for it, and it would come to them when they are in such an attitude as to give it discouraging treatment." After considerable discussion we brought this matter to the full committee. The larger committee heard the discussion, and they agreed to have the "plan" presented to the General Conference in that way. It was not because we ignored it, but because we recognized that the fullness of time had not come. As Bishop Cranston has said, "four years later it came with the unanimous endorsement of our General Conference." [Time extended.] I think that will be the case here. We are not at this time ready to formulate a definite statement concerning this question of the negro relation. And when we formulate it, in my judgment, it should be formulated upon general principles. If we can state a general principle which is logical, I give it as the fundamental basis of all my thinking and acting, that whatsoever is logical will be chronological. Therefore if you hold this matter with others, if such there be, upon which we may differ in abeyance for the present and make a statement of those things on which we practically agree, such as the scope and limitations of the General Conference, of the necessity for the independent but coöperative power of the Regional Conferences and their functions—if you state these things on which we agree and appoint a committee to more

carefully consider all the relationships of the questions involved as general principles with the understanding that some of these may have special application or modification in different areas and let your committee have time to work over these problems until our next meeting, I doubt not that we can make great progress. And that progress will be toward what we all and the great Church behind us are praying that God may bring to consummation. Thus we may hasten the coming of his purposes by not being in undue haste before a constituency which is not quite educated up to its full import.

C. W. Fairbanks: A few years ago I had the pleasure of attending a General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Birmingham as a fraternal lay delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In contemplating what my message should be I was impressed with the idea that I should advocate the reunion of the two great branches of Methodism. I took into my confidence several of my friends and was advised by some of them, who were supposed to be wise, to omit reference to a subject that might be the source of extreme irritation. I was assured that if I ventured upon an argument in favor of reunion I would meet a very chilly reception at the hands of our Southern brethren. I was not impressed with the force of the suggestion. I devoted a fair share of what I had prepared for utterance to declaring the hope that the two great branches of the Methodist Church should come into full organic reunion, and I was amazed to find so many of my Southern brethren who commended the position I had taken. I never was received anywhere with more cordial hospitality. I found upon every hand warm hearts, sympathizing friends. And from that day to this I have been profoundly grateful for it all. It seemed to me then to be monstrous that in the United States of America there should be these divided elements of what should be a united Church. While I have not added to the propaganda of that movement, I have been profoundly impressed by the progress that has been made by you gentlemen and others more intimately engaged in the work of the Master. When I was put upon this Commission by my great Church at Saratoga, I accepted the commission with alacrity, although distrustful of my ability to add to the solution of the great problem. There is an aspect, as I view it, which has not received proper emphasis here, but which has weight in my own mind. That is the tremendous benefit that will flow to the republic of the United States from binding together as one these two mighty armies of Methodism—four millions upon upon the one side, two millions upon the other, standing for the best thoughts and the best purposes of a hundred

million people. The lines of cleavage that so long existed between North and South and the mention of which caused a feeling of acrimony but a few years ago in the providence of God Almighty have disappeared, and the bitter memories of the past are buried beyond the reach of the hand of resurrection. It unfortunately is the case that the currents of social interest, commercial interest, political interest still run too much along the old groove. We fellowship more East and West than we do North and South. It has been my fortune in the past to come into touch with many of you and to pass frequently North and South. And I have felt that if the people could all see what many of us have seen and could come into touch with the great, loyal, noble-hearted North and South it were well for the republic, it were well for us all. There are great questions in the future. God Almighty is solving political problems upon the bloody fields of Europe. What of America? And what is the future of America? I do not know, nor do you. God alone in his omniscience knows. The veil is drawn before our vision. There is one thing I think we may take for granted, and that is that there will be much need in the future of the complete solidarity of the United States. We must have a homogeneous people of 100,000,000, each interested in the other's welfare from one end of the republic to the other. I have had a dream, Mr. Chairman, that it were better for me, for my countrymen, for America if we were a little more thoroughly fused North and South and East and West. I have had the dream that if the great Churches of Methodism were united organically, sympathetically, and doctrinally, if they were fused together with no trace of old divisions, it would strengthen the very foundation of the republic of the United States. [Time extended.] It isn't my purpose unduly to weary your patience. I may have to go westward before your deliberations terminate, but I could not go without a word. I have been profoundly impressed with the spirit of this assembly. I believe it is a composite expression of the best judgment and the will and the feeling of the millions of the North and the millions of the South. How far we are from the day of which I spoke when we met at Birmingham!

Bishop Hoss: I remember your appeal to your "fellow Republicans."

C. W. Fairbanks: Well, I never had so much applause as was evoked by the slip of my tongue. I turned to the venerable Bishop Wilson, who was presiding, and said to him, "Bishop, will you grant me absolution?" and he said he would. And I said at once that the great audience was so magnificent that they made me feel so at home that I felt free

to talk as I liked. I have known, as we all have, some of the practical difficulties that lie between the present and the consummation of our desires. From the time I took up the study of the subject until now that dream has never vanished from my mind, and I hope that in God's providence before I reach the end of my earthly life I may see a consolidated American Methodism. There is much work for the Church to do. The solution of the problems of the future is bound up more and more with moral questions. Who, save God Almighty, can measure the power of a consolidated, reunited Methodist Church? We have always been united in heart, in sentiment, in common Christian experience. We have always realized that there was perhaps one great obstruction in the way. Prejudice? Yes, but prejudice under the influence of Christianity sooner or later fades away. There will be a richer Methodism because of our reunion. Why keep us apart when all the reason on God's earth is in favor of the reunion? I have been in many assemblies, but have never been so profoundly touched as since we convened here a few days ago. I never have seen such harmony of sentiment, such eagerness to come to a common understanding, no disposition to erect barriers, but an ambition to destroy them and come to a final unification, each man praying for the Sovereign of the universe to give him the wisdom to see the way. I have been walking in darkness seeking light. But I have been receiving from hands that have given me strength. The problem is a great one. Of course it is. So much the more necessity for prayer and effort. I see the temper of the men about me and understand the quality of the elements here with which we are dealing. There is no such thing as failure. I have heard here from some of our good friends now and then a word of skepticism. I have no skepticism whatever, but fear, and only a little of that, because when men's hearts are attuned aright they will all strike the same note in harmony sooner or later. It occurs to me that we have come to about this complexion: there is no one of us who has a formulated plan that commands our own approval. There is no one here who in a day or a week could formulate a plan with which we would be satisfied. It is a great problem. It commands our patience and genius. When we come to a conclusion, we want it so clear, so comprehensive that it will not require the presence of an editorial board in order to interpret our conclusions. Now, our good Brother McDowell has made a suggestion which seems to me eminently practical and wise. That is, after we have interchanged in a thoroughly frank, fearless, friendly way our respective views, it is quite fitting for us as the next appropriate step in the important enterprise to ap-

point a committee, equitably distributed, and to the committee commit all that has been suggested in the way of a reunion. And then after a reasonable time let the committee report its conclusions, and then let us reassemble and pass upon them finally. I wish I could tell you how my heart yearns to see the consummation of this great historic work. It is historic. It is Methodistic. It is, in my judgment, the most important work in America to-day; I care not whether secular or religious. We shall fall far below our Christian duty if we fail to give the sanction of our best judgment and the weight of our most ardent prayers to the consummation of the great work of unity.

J. M. Moore: I move that the question of the status of the colored membership of the negotiating Churches be referred to a committee of five from each Church, composed of one bishop, two ministers, and two laymen from each Church.

P. D. Maddin: I will suggest this: It seems to me that we have already made very great progress in the consideration of this question of unification. I feel that in coming to this meeting we did not come at liberty to follow our individual views. We came under the instructions of our respective General Conferences. I feel that it is the duty of each of us to use our best efforts to arrive at a basis upon which these two great branches of Methodism can be united. Wonderful progress has been made during the few days we have been in session. When we came I doubt if the most sanguine of us expected we could make such progress as we have made. There has been such frank, honest, and friendly interchange of views that each side understands fully the difficulties of the other side. But upon what seems to be the most difficult question I think that each side understands that that difficulty is not of our own making. It has existed for years. With us it has existed for generations. We cannot affect it or help it. But there may be some way by which a union can be brought about in spite of these difficulties. We have discussed the matter for four days. It is manifest that we cannot now formulate any plan upon which we could agree. So I think it will be better to adopt Bishop McDowell's suggestion and refer to one or more committees the whole question of unification. We cannot agree upon things by piecemeal. We must have an entire plan, and it ought to be worked out by a committee composed of as many as this organization should decide. I therefore move, in place of Brother Moore's motion, that the whole matter of a plan of union be referred to a committee to be raised probably one part by one Commission and the other part by the other. I give my cordial approval to Bishop McDowell's suggestion.

Bishop McDowell: I think Brother Maddin must have misinterpreted my statement. It was not my thought to refer to one committee the preparation of a full plan of unification. My thought was that we were discussing the subject of the colored membership and its status in the united Church, and that on the basis of the principles which I tried to state a committee on that subject should be created. But it is my firm conviction that we ought, in the line of Dr. Goucher's suggestion of the other day, to create a number of standing committees to which the different subjects should be referred, to report to a later meeting of this Joint Commission. I should deplore exceedingly the reference of one topic to the committee and not the reference of all, just as I should deplore exceedingly a positive declaration upon any one subject and the leaving of other subjects still in the air, as though we had reached an agreement upon any subject, which we have not. We are no farther along in our formal agreement than the General Conferences—that is, we have agreed on basic principles. That is all that the discussion amounts to up to date. I should, therefore, favor not Brother Maddin's motion, but Brother Moore's with Dr. Rogers's understanding of it. And in addition to that, for the purpose of determining what committees should be created, we ought either to devote ourselves to that subject now for a moment or make it the subject for our evening discussion.

Bishop Denny: I will ask you not to undertake interference at this stage of parliamentary proceedings. I did not know that discussion on this matter is about to cease. I had not altogether satisfactorily formulated my own views, and I have not put very much emphasis on the importance of my views before this Commission. But so far as I have gone in my own thinking, to take up this status of our negro friends, our interests are in part common and in part not common. The part common, so far as I understand it, is that whatever is demanded by justice, by kindness, or necessarily by the responsibility of our ability to do for the benefit of our colored brethren ought to be done. That part is common. I cannot see any room for any color line through those points. For myself, I have often gone back with repentance, in some instances with strong crying and tears to God, not that I was not kind to the negro and did not preach to him and try to help him and do what I could for those who have come over our threshholds. My wife is now nursing our negro servant. But I have never felt that words met the need, and no sermons that I could preach and no expressions of interest that I could offer have satisfied my own conviction of responsibility. I do not know how to solve this matter. I am satis-

fied that the efforts made by our Methodist Episcopal Church brethren are not solutions for it in the main. I am old enough to remember those old days of mixed schools and mixed Conferences. I saw their failure. They could not succeed, not because we are not willing for it; that is not the matter; but something more is needed than that kind of relation to solve the problems that are represented by the status of the negro in the country. As far as I can see (and I do not profess to see through this question; I have never seen through it), if I know my own heart, I am perfectly willing to follow where God will lead; but I am not always willing to let some brother interpret God's will. We are not dealing with just the 350,000. That has been stated; but I want to emphasize it that that does not solve the question. There are millions of our friends. In the providence of God they are brought to our door. They are here, and we are going to be held responsible for their uplift. We have not been doing all that could be done. I make that confession for myself. Would a Church in which the negro brethren have their inherent rights, as those now in the Methodist Episcopal Church have, solve this matter? I know these brethren have their vested rights. I know what a vested right is. You cannot displace it if you want to. Every lawyer here would assent to the statement that that brother could walk into the courts of the land and stop you. What is the use in talking about the impossible? We know you cannot put these brethren out. On the other hand, can you bring them and all the rest into one common Church? No, you cannot do that. If we could lay our hand on all the negroes in this country now and bring them into the same vested rights that the negroes in your Church have, it would not be for their benefit to do it. You have before you a section of the problem. I am afraid you have taken too short a view of it. You seem to me to be doing it simply from the standpoint of these 350,000. We ought to think of the 10,000,000. I do not see that you can solve it that way. If the negro brethren were perfectly willing, and only if they would be willing, if they be willing to adopt and accept an independent organization, and unless that be best for them, they ought not to accept. It would be folly for us to undertake to go into methods of procedure and kinds of work that would not be for the best interests of the men that we are considering; but if they should be willing to do that, then we might be able to form some nexus. But here we are, because every time we get up to this chasm we fail to throw a bridge across it. My Brother Hamilton did not do it. None of the men on our side have done it. But if we could find some nexus that would protect the self-respect, and if you do not

protect that, you have done no good for the negro. He has got to have his self-respect protected and developed. He would not come to such a stature of manhood as he ought to reach without that. I have held that there is no such thing as education that does not lead to independent judgment and action. I do not care how much knowledge you put into a man. If I have put anything into my five children, it is the idea that they must not lean on me as a crutch. That is a general principle with me. We must find some method, if possible, by which we can develop the self-respect not simply of those 350,000. That is only a very small part of this as I think of this question. But where can we bring these brethren to the point of development up to the measure of their ability at once? If I knew what to say to you as a plan, I would be glad to do so. But I do not know. If I understand the people in my own section, I am not going to throw all the responsibility onto the negro; but it is not best for him that he should be allowed to make our laws. How can we settle that? With their vested rights, with your history, and with our history involved in it, how can we settle it? I would be glad to listen to any statement that would settle it, and if it were settled I would be glad. But, brethren, I am not yet willing to accept somebody's interpretation of the mind of God as the divine solution of the question.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that we do now adjourn to meet at eight o'clock this evening.

Edgar Blake: I simply want to raise a question, not necessarily to raise an objection to Bishop Mouzon's motion, unless it shall seem to meet with the approval of the members of the Joint Commission. We have been listening for two days to a very careful and a very illuminating discussion of these very important matters. The question I desire to raise now is this: We have been discussing these very important matters for two days in committee of the whole. I wonder if it is not now desirable that the two Commissions should have opportunity to meet separately to consider these matters before we come to any final action either as to committees we shall appoint or any other action we shall take. I think there are some members who would like to have such opportunity. I simply raise the question. I make no motion. Would it not be desirable that the two Commissions have an opportunity to meet this evening by themselves? My own judgment is that it is highly desirable that we be given such an opportunity.

At this point the motion to adjourn to eight o'clock to-night was seconded.

Bishop Hoss: I am constitutionally very slow of mind and

need a great deal of thinking in order to reach my conclusions. I am also so constituted that I am likely to stand by them after I do reach them. I approve the suggestion that we have a meeting of the separate Commissions to-night.

A. J. Lamar: I want to call attention to this: If we are not to waste perhaps a day of our time, it is very important that we act upon that question of committees now, then to-night have a meeting of our separate sections to appoint those committees. If we meet here to-morrow morning with the appointment of those committees, we simply spend another day in talk, and we get nowhere. We should agree to appoint those committees now in this Commission. Then let the sections meet separately and select their committees.

Bishop McDowell: I agree with the suggestion of Dr. Blake that it would be well to have meetings of the separate Commissions this evening, also with the suggestion of Dr. Lamar that perhaps we should send to those separate sections the question of these committees. Dr. Goucher proposed the other day that there should be five standing committees—a committee on Conferences, one on the itinerancy, one on Church membership, one on benevolences, including Epworth Leagues, Sunday schools, and education, and a committee on book concerns and other financial interests. But this Joint Committee has not agreed as to what standing committees should be created. In the order of procedure which was reported we suggested that after this informal discussion suitable committees should be created. No designation was proposed by the Committee on Organization and Procedure. It would be useless for the Commissions to meet separately and appoint different kinds of committees. If we could reach an agreement now before adjournment as to the standing committees we should appoint this evening, I think we should make real progress in the line of Dr. Lamar's suggestion.

Bishop Hoss: Would not the committees naturally be committees on the subjects we have discussed during the last three days?

Bishop McDowell: It would be proper, then, to move that each Commission should designate five persons for each of the three committees whose subjects have been under discussion since Saturday morning; a standing committee on the General Conference. That would carry with it all the questions as to legislative and judicial functions, for I know you are of opinion that there ought to be a standing committee on these functions separately. If one standing committee has the subject of the General Conference and another the subject of the Regional Conferences, and another the subject of

the negro membership, that would constitute three standing committees.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question before us is this motion to adjourn to a specified hour. I wish to determine the motion to adjourn to eight o'clock. We were up late last night and have been here continuously through the day. We shall not make progress to-night by coming back here. I hope we shall not meet until to-morrow in any capacity.

J. W. Van Cleve: I move to amend that motion to the effect that when we adjourn it be to meet to-morrow at ten o'clock.

Edgar Blake: I move to substitute for all before us that when we adjourn it be to meet at 9:30 in the morning.

This amendment was accepted by the mover.

Bishop Mouzon: I understand from the general trend of remarks that have been made that we are now contemplating three standing committees to which these several items which we have been discussing shall be referred. If I have understood the purpose of the remarks made concerning these committees, they were to report to these several subjects to some future meeting of this Commission. If that is not so, I am glad. I am quite sure that we shall find it necessary to give ample time to this last committee to be named, that has been suggested, on the status of the colored brother in the reorganized Church. We are not ready for final answer to that question. They should report to some future meeting of this Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question before us is about the adjournment.

Bishop Mouzon: I understand that. I think it important that committees should be appointed to bring in some conclusive action concerning the first item and the second item that have been discussed. In the appointing of these committees that should be had in view. We must carry to our Churches some definite, conclusive report touching the Jurisdictional Conferences. I hope we shall not adjourn until we have made provision for such committees as that.

The vote was taken on the motion that when the Commission adjourns it be to meet the next morning at 9:30, and this motion prevailed.

Bishop McDowell: I move that when we adjourn it be to meet in separate sections this evening for the purpose of creating three committees—one a committee on the General Conference, one on Jurisdictional Conferences, one on the status of the colored membership in the reunited Church—these committees to be composed of ten persons each, five

from each of the Commissions, one bishop, two laymen, and two ministers, to be chosen as the Commissions themselves wish.

Bishop Cranston: I want to raise again the question which Dr. Goucher has asked, How can we treat the subject of the General Conference intelligently without discussing at the same time the relative place of the Jurisdictional Conferences? Why not have a committee on the Conferences?

Bishop McDowell: My personal preference would be in the line of Dr. Goucher's suggestion of five committees. My personal conviction is somewhat against Bishop Mouzon's idea. I think we should not adjourn finally *sine die*, but to a specified time. Personally I would prefer the appointment of a group of five standing committees, as suggested by Dr. Goucher. They would be committees on Conferences, on itinerancy, on membership, on benevolences, on publishing and other financial interests.

M. L. Walton: I desire to oppose the motion of Bishop McDowell that the Commissions meet to-night separately. He has stated as the object of the meeting the naming of the various committees. No such necessity is imposed upon our Commission, because we have already determined that question in advance. If it is determined here what the committees shall be, there will be no necessity of our Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, meeting separately, because the chairman has been designated to name committees. If the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church desire to meet, of course let them do so.

Edgar Blake: I desire to move as a substitute for Bishop McDowell's motion that we order the creation of the following committees (I am dropping out that part of the motion that obliges the sections to meet):

1. A committee on supreme court: its composition, character, and powers.
2. A committee on the composition as legislative powers of the General Conference, and on the number, composition, and powers of the Quadrennial Conferences.
3. A committee on the status of the colored membership in the reorganized Church.

I will state my reason for offering that motion for the committees.

At this point Bishop Denny took the chair.

Edgar Blake: Let me call your attention to suggestion 8: "We suggest that neither the General Conference nor any Quadrennial Conference be invested with final authority to interpret the constitutionality of its own actions." It would seem that that is a question of sufficient importance to command all the time and attention of about as good a commit-

tee as we can create here. The point in one committee on General and Quadrennial Conferences is that the committee which attempts to define what are the connectional interests that are to be committed to the General Conference is the committee that ought also to have in its view the local affairs to be committed to the Quadrennial Conferences. I think one committee ought to handle those particular items.

Bishop McDowell: I could be happy with either Dr. Blake's or Dr. Goucher's proposal.

W. N. Ainsworth: I could approve the suggestion made by Dr. Blake and believe it will more fully meet the necessities of the case than the other plan proposed.

D. G. Downey: What is the number for each committee contemplated in the motion?

Edgar Blake: I had in mind five from each Commission.

D. G. Downey: I suggest that the committee on the status of the colored membership be composed of twelve. I am quite sure that you will see that Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn ought to be on that committee, and if they are so placed there will be in addition only one minister and one layman from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

D. G. Downey's amendment was seconded.

A. F. Watkins: I trust that the instruction to look into the appointment of these committees does not commit this Joint Commission to settle any one or two of these three questions. I am impressed that it would be better for us when we finally adjourn to do so with the statement that the committees have been appointed to consider these various interests, that progress has been made, and not attempt to reach definite and positive results. I would ask whether or not the appointment of these committees forecasts the policy on the part of the Joint Commission of making positive reports.

Edgar Blake: I suggest that Dr. Downey withhold his suggestion as to the number until we fix what the committee shall be.

A. F. Watkins: My vote on the question would be determined by the answer to the question that I ask. I am so strongly convinced that we ought not to send out a positive statement on these points that I would have to vote against such a committee.

Bishop Mouzon: I am quite sure that there are one or two things that should be said at the conclusion of this meeting. I am sure that if we adjourn and leave everything tentative and provisional the two Churches will be disappointed, and the impression is likely to prevail that we have met and had a good religious time and done nothing at all. I wish you to bear this in mind. Certainly concerning the General Confer-

ence and its powers and limitations you cannot bring in any perfected report. But there is one thing that you should be able to say, that we are agreed that the General Conference shall not interpret the constitutionality of its own acts. Concerning the Jurisdictional Conferences, you are not ready yet to bring in a detailed report. But I believe you are ready to report that we are agreed that the Jurisdictional Conferences shall not be supervisory Conferences merely, but shall have legislative powers as well. And as to the number and the functions of these Jurisdictional Conferences you may not yet be ready to report. Now, there is a third item, the status of the colored brother in the reorganized Church. You are not ready to report on that. But permit me to say that I am sure that what the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is interested in is just these three items that we have been discussing. If you can settle those three items, the working out of a plan will just take time and be a matter of detail. I earnestly desire that we may be able to say to our Methodism that we have settled the crucial point of the first item, that we agree as to the crucial point of the second item, that the only difficulty before us now is to find a Christian and reasonable and workable solution of the problem related to the third item so as to focalize the attention of the two Churches upon that, and, above all, the attention of our colored brethren upon that. Let us be thinking about that. Let them see that that is the real difficulty before us. And if we will do this and pray over these questions when we come together again, we shall be able to do something, I do devoutly hope.

J. H. Reynolds: Is it contemplated that these committees shall report to-morrow morning? Is there to be any report during this meeting of the Joint Commission?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): They will be announced to-morrow.

J. H. Reynolds: We may be able to make definite announcements on two or three points; but if it is contemplated that we will try to make a definite statement as to the status of the colored men, we shall make a big mistake.

Bishop Candler: I do not think the proposition to appoint more than the three committees on the three leading subjects we have discussed is a wise one. Those are the matters we need to determine. When we should come to make a Discipline, if we should agree on these three points, we should have to enlarge the committee. But at this stage of the meeting of the Commission it appears to me that no more than three committees would be wise. With reference to the remarks of Bishop Mouzon, you can't call for reports from any one of those three committees now because of their affiliation

with one another. One of the very vital issues with reference to the status of the colored membership is closely connected with that of the General Conference. However desirable it be to make a statement as to some of these matters, I do not see how you can make it officially or reassuringly until you are ready to settle all, because they are so bound up together.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The question is on the substitute of Dr. Blake.

Bishop McDowell: I accepted it, and let it be the original motion.

The substitute offered by Dr. Blake and stated above was put to vote and unanimously adopted.

Bishop McDowell: The Committee on Organization and Procedure, I think, would recommend that these committees consist of five persons from each Commission, to be composed of two ministers, two laymen, and one bishop from each Commission.

D. G. Downey: I move that the Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership shall consist of fourteen members —one bishop, three ministers, and three laymen from each Church.

This was seconded.

Bishop Cranston: I hardly know what is in the mind of these brethren. It seems to me that we are constituting very important committees. They might well be larger than proposed. There will be left after these committees are appointed twenty men of this Commission with nothing to do but wait until these committees report. I am going to move that these committees consist of fifteen members each.

The motion was seconded.

A. J. Lamar: I think that my brethren who know me will not accuse me of stinginess or penuriousness. But as one of the Treasurers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, I have to consider the matter of spending money. The committee of fifteen means more expense. Another consideration: every man, I expect, on this committee will agree that the smaller each committee is, so that it is in a fair degree representative, the more effective the committee is. The more you have on a committee, the greater is the difficulty of transacting the work before you. If your committee is representative, ten is big enough.

Bishop Cranston: My thought was that you were expecting to have two of these committees report before our final adjournment here. I would not press the question at all if it require the coming together of fifteen men between joint sessions.

Bishop McDowell: It is evident that to get any reports here this would have to happen, that these committees just appointed would have to go into session to-morrow and remain in session indefinitely here, while the rest of us who were not on committees would be just sitting around waiting for reports.

Bishop Cranston withdrew his motion.

D. G. Downey's motion for seven men from each Commission was adopted.

The resolution as amended was then adopted.

H. M. Du Bose: I desire to leave with the Secretary a copy of my remarks of this morning to go to the committee.

Dr. Ainsworth made the same suggestion.

Bishop McDowell: This afternoon I ventured to express the hope that to the committee thus constituted should go not only Dr. Du Bose's statement, but Dr. Ainsworth's statement and the deliverances of the Joint Commission and of the two General Conferences and any other statements that have been made to this body or might be made by commissioners from this body, together with the debate that has proceeded from this morning and the different documents that have been presented here that bear upon the work of these committees, together with such debates as have been had.

A motion to that effect was adopted.

R. E. Jones was excused from further attendance.

Bishop McDowell: I understand that Dr. Jones desires leave of absence from this time. I move that we assure him of our great appreciation of his spirit and purpose in coming here and of our earnest prayers for God's blessing upon his family in this hour of extreme anxiety. [This last remark alluded to a statement by Dr. Jones of illness in his family.]

This motion was adopted.

The session closed at 6:10 P.M. with the doxology, and the benediction pronounced by Bishop Denny.

FIFTH DAY, TUESDAY, JANUARY 2, 1917

Bishop Candler called the meeting to order at 9:39 A.M. and led in singing Hymn 566, "I Need Thee Every Hour." Claudio B. Spencer offered prayer.

Bishop Hamilton: I have been fortunate in having presented to me the New Testament which John Wesley's mother gave him when he started to the Charter House School and which he had with him there, a very well-preserved book from which Dr. Watkins this morning will read the lesson.

Dr. Watkins read a selection from the second chapter of

Corinthians, "If there be therefore any consolation in Christ Jesus," etc. Another hymn was sung:

"More love to thee, O Christ,
More love to thee!"

E. B. Chappell offered prayer.

Secretary Harris called the roll, and the following commissioners were present: Bishops—Earl Cranston, W. F. McDowell, J. A. Hamilton, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, E. E. Hoss, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Ministers—Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, A. J. Nast, Frank Naff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen—G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, I. E. Robinson, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rollo V. Watt, H. W. Rogers, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think it important at this juncture to make a motion touching our procedure. I move that a committee of four, two from each Commission, be designated by the respective chairmen to prepare a statement of our deliberations and conclusions, such as the Church is entitled to have, to be reported back to this body as early as practicable, certainly not later than the early afternoon, for our review and adoption.

This motion was seconde.

T. D. Samford: I move to amend the motion by adding that the committees shall report back to the full Commission within one hour.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We may not be through in an hour, and we cannot tell what we may do until we have done it.

T. D. Samford: At the end of an hour's conference they could at least report to the committee whether or not they are through.

Mr. Samford's motion was seconded.

W. N. Ainsworth: It is manifestly impossible, as I view the situation now, for any committee to be constituted with such wisdom that they could bring back the kind of a report that we ought to have in an hour's time. Moreover, we may do some things this morning that should be included in that report.

D. G. Downey: I think Brother Ainsworth's statement is correct, that it would not be wise to instruct them to bring in a

statement within an hour. It seemed to us when we were meeting last night that such a statement would be the thing and that probably it would be well to commit that matter to the Committee on Organization and Procedure, which is a little larger committee. I do not know that that would meet your approval or that we would object to the committee you suggest. I simply put that forward as a suggestion. I do not wish to make an amendment to your motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The subcommittee mentioned by Dr. Ainsworth is better. It is smaller, and these very large committees work slowly always, by the very nature of their composition. I rather think the motion of Dr. Ainsworth is preferable for the purpose indicated. The other would require too many to retire.

Edgar Blake: I see the force of what Bishop Candler has said. At the same time I think that committee ought to be sufficiently large in numbers to be thoroughly representative, so that when the report comes to the attention of this body it will probably represent the judgment of the various interests in the Joint Commission. If that Commission or that committee were made up of three from each Commission, if you saw fit to make up the committee in this fashion, one bishop, one minister, and one layman from each Commission, that would represent the various interests in the Commission. I think that would be rather more representative and would not be large enough to hamper the efficiency of this body when that committee retired. I would like to move that the committees consist of three from each Commission rather than two.

W. N. Ainsworth: I have been anxious to guard the size of the committee only because we shall not be liable to get a report out of a large committee as soon as a smaller one. However, I will not contend at that point. To make a committee consisting of three on each side increases it but slightly, and I will accept that.

The amendment that the committee be required to report in one hour was not adopted.

The motion that the committee be composed of three on each side prevailed.

C. M. Bishop: Yesterday afternoon I had the privilege of making a modest suggestion here with reference to the matter which was before us for discussion, and a number of brethren suggested that it be put in written form so as to come before the body. Somebody told me that it had been ordered so. I have prepared the written form and would like to read it. It will take only one minute. [The paper was read as follows: "Proposed, that in the reorganizing of the

new Church it shall be provided that legislation may be done in racial and national sections. Secondly, that in harmony with this provision the colored membership of the Churches entering into this union shall be considered a racial section, with local Churches, Annual Conferences, Regional Conferences, and a General Conference of their own. However, there shall be some intercommunicating body or bodies between the General Conferences of the racial or national sections and that of the parent body, which shall preserve their vital connection and protect the constitution of the Church."] I only ask permission to lay this paper upon the table with the Secretary.

On motion of Edgar Blake, the paper was referred to the Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership in the Reorganized Church.

J. M. Moore: The name of one of our committees is "The Supreme Court." I believe that many of us would be better pleased if you would change the name of that committee to "Judicial Council." I think there are good reasons for that. I believe that name would be better in every way and not carry ideas that we are not ready at least to incorporate. I move that the name of the committee be changed from "The Supreme Court" to "Judicial Council."

This was seconded.

Bishop Cooke: I think that is a very wise motion. The idea, while we have used the term all through in our discussions of this subject, has always conveyed the thought that there was undue emphasis placed upon legal matters in the Church and that they would probably be overemphasized to the disadvantage of the spiritual. We have used that term as interchangeable. We have had three terms before us, "Supreme Court," "Final Court of Appeals," and "Judicial Council." Another term has been "The Judicial Conference." Since the word "Conference" will be used with reference to other bodies in the Church, I think it would be very wise that we should select a differentiating term. I do not think of any better term than that which has been proposed. "Judicial Council" will distinguish it from every other Conference that might be necessary in the Regional Districts, such as Judicial Conferences, appeals from which would be made to this Judicial Council. I second the motion that it be agreed that the name of this final court of appeals shall be "Judicial Council."

Bishop Murrah: I most decidedly approve the suggestion that the name be changed. I do not altogether like the name "Council." I would not contend for it. I think I should approve "Tribunal."

Ira E. Robinson: I agree with Bishop Murrah. I do not like the word "Council." We ought to retain the word "Conference" even as to the proposed tribunal. The word "Judicial" will distinguish it from any other conference. It is Methodistic to say "Conference." I admit that it is a small matter. Yet if we call it a judicial council for the present, I think we will continue to call it that in the future.

E. C. Reeves: Whether that shall be a "Supreme Tribunal" or a "Supreme Council" depends. If that is to be the end, if that is to be the end of the question, that will do. It will be supreme. But suppose that after it has taken this action, in the wisdom of this committee, they should wish to refer the matter to the Annual Conferences to have the final say, then it could not be a "Supreme Tribunal" or a "Supreme Council." Therefore I suggest, for the present at least, that we call it a "Judicial Tribunal" or a "Judicial Council," I do not care which.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): This is not a question of the terminology to be used with reference to any tribunal that may be formed, but the designation of a committee. I rather prefer the designation suggested by my Brother Murrah.

F. M. Thomas: We already have the "Federal Council of Methodism," which is charged with powers similar to those that might be given to this body. I think, following that analogy, until we finally determine the title, that the appropriate name for the present would be "Judicial Council."

Bishop Cranston: I do not think the name is very material. I suppose they aim at the same substance. I very much like the name suggested by Judge Robinson, but I think it should be understood if we adopt Brother Robinson's motion that the committee having this subject in charge are at liberty to report another name if they find it better to do so.

Bishop Cooke: The reason why it is not preferable to some of us to use the word "Judicial Conference" is this, that there may be other judicial conferences required. We would not know what we were talking about when we were talking about the "Judicial Conference," whether the Supreme Judicial Conference or the Regional Judicial Conference. In order to have a distinctive term for the present, we selected the word "Council."

Bishop Murrah: I move as an amendment to substitute for the name suggested, "Judicial Council," "Judicial Tribunal."

Bishop Mouzon: The word "Conference" is a word we do not want. There are two reasons, the reason that has been given by Bishop Cooke and another. A conference is something that meets and adjourns. This Council must have con-

tinuous life. For that reason I prefer the suggestion made that we call this committee a "Judicial Council."

Bishop Murrah: It was not my purpose to determine the name, the ultimate name of this body. It was merely to designate the name under which this committee should act for the present.

Bishop Cranston: The original motion was that the term "Judicial Council" be substituted for "Supreme Court." It was moved that it be called "Judicial Conference." Bishop Murrah moved that it be called "Judicial Tribunal." The question is on substituting "Tribunal" for Council."

This was not done. "Judicial Council" was adopted as the name.

Bishop Hamilton took the chair.

A discussion of some length took place as to how many copies and how full copies of the official stenographer's notes should be made, also as to the printing of further copies and as to the editing of the stenographic report. It was finally decided that the official stenographer, Rev. A. H. Herrick, of the New England Conference, should furnish four copies of his stenographic report complete except as to minor editing. This further action was taken: "The Secretaries are directed to edit the stenographic report of the debates and to have printed two hundred and fifty copies, two copies for each commissioner and each alternate and the balance for reserve. The remarks of each speaker shall be submitted to him. But if he does not make return within thirty days, it shall be assumed that he does not care to make changes. All the documents shall be kept in the archives, and none of them shall be destroyed."

The Chairman announced the Joint Committee on Statement as follows: Bishop Cooke, D. G. Downey, Alexander Simpson, Jr., for the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Bishop Mouzon, W. N. Ainsworth, M. L. Walton, for the Methodist Church, South.

Bishop Cranston took the chair.

T. D. Samford: I think it should be understood that the chairmen of the respective committees have authority to fill vacancies on the standing committees during the interim of the meetings of this Joint Commission.

Bishop Denny: Is not that a matter for determination by each Commission? We have committed it to our Chairman.

Bishop Cranston: The Methodist Episcopal Church have made the same arrangement.

W. N. Ainsworth: Cannot we also at this moment have the announcement of the three standing committees voted yesterday?

F. M. Thomas read for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: The Committee on Judicial Council—Bishop Murrah, F. M. Thomas, A. J. Lamar, M. L. Walton, E. C. Reeves; Committee on Conferences—Bishop E. E. Hoss, H. M. Du Bose, E. B. Chappell, T. D. Samford, R. S. Hyer; Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership in the Reorganized Church—Bishop Denny, J. M. Moore, W. N. Ainsworth, W. J. Young, H. H. White, P. D. Maddin, H. N. Snyder.

Secretary Harris read the following for the Methodist Episcopal Church: The Committee on the Judicial Council—Bishop Cooke, D. G. Downey, C. B. Spencer, C. W. Fairbanks, I. E. Robinson; Committee on the Conferences—Bishop McDowell, Edgar Blake, J. F. Goucher, Alexander Simpson, Jr., A. W. Harris; alternate—Bishop Leete; Committee on the Status of the Negro—Bishop Cranston, R. E. Jones, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, G. W. Brown.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It might be well that these committees get together before we separate and organize and agree upon a time and place for their joint meeting. Otherwise it will require a good deal of correspondence to adjust that matter. I will call the Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership to meet immediately on adjournment this morning.

W. N. Ainsworth: I make this suggestion, that in our arrangements for future meetings of these committees we ask to get together on this proposition—namely, for these various committees to have their stated meetings at the same place where the Joint Commission will meet when agreed upon next time and during the week preceding the meeting of the Joint Commission, so that one trip and one expense of travel may cover it all.

The chairmen of the committees just announced instructed their committees when and where to meet.

The Committee on the Address to be Issued to the Church were excused, that they might meet at once.

Bishop McDowell suggested that it might be well to take a recess and allow these meetings that have just been called to be held at once, but after remarks by Dr. Blake and Mr. Walton he withdrew the suggestion.

Edgar Blake: I would call attention to the fact that there are several items upon which some preliminary investigation ought to be made. For instance, in the suggestion of the original Joint Commission on Federation two names were proposed for the reorganized Church. Again, it was proposed that we have common Articles of Faith. As I understand it,

we have Articles of Faith in the two Churches that are identical. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the General Rules are a part of the constitution.

Bishop Denny: We do not agree on that. They are protected by the constitution, but are not a part of it.

Edgar Blake: In other words, your General Rules cannot be changed except by constitutional action. Ours are the same. Now, there are certain differences in the General Rules of the two Churches. If the General Rules of the reorganized Church (if we shall come to that) are to form a part of the constitution or to be protected by the constitution, necessarily there will have to be some work of harmony carried on. This is a matter that some committee ought to be investigating for us. In addition to that, there are certain connectional funds and properties, a very careful study of which ought to be made, it seems to me. We ought to have a work of exploration concerning some of these matters. I think it is highly desirable that we have a committee representing the Joint Commission that should be at work on these matters.

Bishop Hoss: Another matter of the same sort. "Common conditions of membership." That is a matter of the very gravest importance. We do not have exactly the same conditions of membership that you have.

Edgar Blake: I would move that there be appointed a Committee of General Reference, which shall consider and report on the following items: The general form and contents of the constitution. I mean by that what are to be considered as constitutional matters. Second, the name for the proposed reorganized Church. Third, the general conditions of membership. Fourth, matters connected with the management and control of connectional funds, properties, and interests. I have stated one reason for making the motion—namely, that we ought to have information concerning these subjects. There is another reason, a minor one, yet a valid one. There are a number of the Commission not sitting on any committee who might well be employed.

Bishop Denny: The importance and the difficulty of any question is, of course, largely determined by the attitude of the individual. It does not seem to me that there will be any difficulty whatever in settling such matters as Dr. Blake and Bishop Hoss have mentioned if we can settle other matters. There are some differences—I would not call them slight, because in their day they have caused no small disturbance—in the General Conference. But all those differences now belong to historic geology. We shall have no difficulty about those matters. When it comes to the terms of membership, and I am speaking still in the light of the fact that the impor-

tance and difficulty are dependent on the individual who is taking the view, for myself I should not think that there would be the slightest trouble in arranging the terms of membership; at least there would not be to me. I do not think we ought to have all these committees appointed. You brethren will excuse us, but the question of the pocketbook has not ceased to be an issue with us. We don't handle such funds as you are accustomed to handle. Anything that adds to the expense of meetings of this Joint Commission (and the expense of committee meetings will necessarily add to expense) we have to guard carefully. And unless such committees be a necessity, I hope the Commission will not authorize any more, if for no other reason than the expense.

G. W. Brown: I suggest that we are assuming that we are on the King's business. I suppose Brother Blake has in mind the saying, "The King's business requires haste." We do not want to have haste unnecessarily. At the same time that matter of conserving the time should have consideration. If we are going on the idea that that work which we are to do is something constructive, we might have faith enough to go ahead and get things in order as rapidly as we can without undue haste.

J. M. Moore: I second with pleasure the motion made by Dr. Blake. I believe that such an exploration as he has indicated will be exceedingly valuable to this Commission when we come together again. The matters have not been considered by the Commission, but they must be if we go forward with our work, which I confidently believe will be done. I have the utmost confidence in the ultimate consummation of this movement for the unification of Methodism. I am absolutely unshaken in my faith. My daily prayer is that God may so direct us that this great wish of our hearts and of the hearts of millions of our people may become a reality. I think it would be well to employ the fine talents of these men who are not otherwise used in making this exploration and bringing to us the facts that would be of immense value to us when we get together again. That Commission need not be very expensive. Much of their work, perhaps, can be done by correspondence. I believe that this would be valuable. I heartily support the motion made by Dr. Blake.

E. B. Chappell: I believe we will expedite matters by the appointment of such a Commission as that. The expense need not be great, perhaps only a few dollars before the next meeting of the Joint Commission. Does Dr. Blake understand that this would be a committee of ten composed as the other committees?

Edgar Blake: I did not include the number, simply because

I did not want to bring that into the discussion. I want the question whether we shall have a committee of this character settled on its merits. We can dispose of the number very easily as soon as we adopt this.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): If you adopt Dr. Ainsworth's suggestion that these committees for their final deliberations and agreements and published reports shall meet at the same place as the Joint Commission and the week before, it seems to me that a committee like this might include those of the commissioners on both sides who are assigned to other committees and that they might divide up the work before they leave among subcommittees, so that the expense will not be much increased by this Committee of General Reference. I did not get the exact wording of Dr. Blake's resolution, and I wonder if it has in it such a phrase as this: "Such other matters as may be committed to it." For instance, there is the very important matter of lay representation in the Annual Conferences.

Bishop McDowell: That belongs to the Committee on Conferences.

Bishop Hoss: I hope we shall not adopt this under the impression that it is really a very unimportant committee. If any man thinks he can settle the terms of membership in the new Methodist Church, he is much mistaken. I never will submit to any credal conditions of membership in the Church. I will never ask a man whether he believes in twenty-five Articles. I would like to go back to the old Wesleyan test, a desire to flee from the wrath to come and be saved from sin. I know that I am not going to have my way without some trouble.

The committee was ordered.

Edgar Blake: I move that the committee consist of eight representatives from each of the Commissions. That will take the balance of the commissioners who are not assigned to other committees.

Bishop Candler: It does not seem to me that we need to make a committee of sixteen. I am one of those members of the Commission who have no work, and I am extremely gratified for that. I cannot think any member would feel troubled at not being on a committee.

Edgar Blake: My reason for making a committee of eight is twofold. First, that we may employ and have the advantage of all the talent of these two Commissions; secondly, because of the variety of subjects committed to those two Commissions. I think you will find that, this being a committee on general reference and because of the fact that there are several subjects to it, that committee ought to be large

enough to subdivide and commit special subjects to special groups.

The motion prevailed.

C. W. Fairbanks was at this point excused from further attendance.

A large number of telegrams and messages, all urging that unification be accomplished, were announced by Secretaries Thomas and Harris.

H. H. White: I think it is appropriate to move a vote of thanks to the presiding officers of this Commission for their courtesy and consideration, to the Secretaries for their very efficient labor, to the Churches that have furnished the quarters for the meetings, and to Dr. Goucher for many courtesies shown members of the Commission.

This was adopted by a rising vote.

The expression of thanks was extended to include the President of Goucher College, Dr. W. W. Guth, and the Preachers' Meeting of Baltimore.

F. M. Thomas: I move that the Secretaries be instructed to divide the necessary expenses of the session of the Joint Commission and, if they deem it wise, have the Journal of the meeting printed.

The motion prevailed.

Bishop Hoss: I would like to know how many sons and grandsons of Methodist preachers are on this Commission.

It was found that the number was sixteen out of fifty.

While the committees that had been appointed were out of the room holding their meetings a large number of members of the Commission spoke of their connection with the Methodist Church. Some of them expressed confidence in eventual unification. This half hour thus spent much resembled an old-fashioned love feast.

F. M. Thomas: I have risen to invite the Joint Commission to hold its next meeting in Louisville. It is no mean city. It is the city where in 1845 the convention was held to make preparations for the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Bascom sleeps there. In no other city in America will you find a more beautiful spirit existing between the two Methodisms and none where you will receive a more cordial welcome.

W. N. Ainsworth: The Committee on Preparation of an Address to the Church have reached substantial agreement as to what shall go into that address. Bishops Mouzon and Cooke are now putting the address in its final form. We think we shall be able to bring that report to this body in the course of a half hour, perhaps, if you choose to prolong your

session a little while. If you do not choose to do that, we can bring it to you at half past two.

G. W. Brown: I feel that I can safely and consistently act as the representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Louis when I most cordially invite you to come for your next meeting of the Joint Commission to St. Louis.

M. L. Walton: I believe we can get through with all our necessary business this mornig so that we can adjourn regularly at one o'clock without an afternoon session. I understand that the one thing we have to do is to receive this report of the committee and then fix on the time and place for the next meeting. I think all that can be done if we extend the time of this session. A number of us are compelled to leave here, and we can go about two o'clock. I move to extend the time of this session to one o'clock.

This was seconded and carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): While the committee was out a motion was made and carried by which the remaining members of both Commissions were constituted a committee of reference to whose charge several important matters that have not yet been covered by any provision should be committed. It is necessary in order to complete that action that the names of these brethren be read, so that some one may call them together and their subcommittees be appointed. The Secretary will please read the names of the brethren who constitute that Committee of General Reference. There are at least three or four very important matters referred to them.

A. W. Harris read the names for the Methodist Episcopal Church: Bishop Hamilton, Bishop Leete, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. W. Kinne, Rolla V. Watt.

W. N. Ainsworth announced the names from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Bishop Candler, Bishop Mouzon, T. N. Ivey, C. M. Bishop, A. F. Watkins, John R. Pepper, R. E. Blackwell, J. H. Reynolds.

It was moved to take up the matter of fixing the time and place of the next meeting of the Joint Commission.

Bishop Candler suggested that that matter be referred to a committee.

Bishop McDowell: Our Commission has a subcommittee composed of five brethren located within easy access, three in this neighborhood and two in New York. If the Commission from the Church, South, has a similar body, it would perhaps facilitate a good many matters, so that we could act jointly from time to time in the intervals between our regular sessions.

J. M. Moore: I am Secretary of Home Missions in our Church. Dr. Chappell is the Secretary of the Sunday School work. Dr. Ivey is used largely in institute work. We have to make our engagements now for the summer and up to the first of September. We need to know when this Commission will meet. If you put this matter in the hands of a committee, it may be a month or two before we know. It is very desirable that we determine here and now.

The motion to fix the time and place now was carried.

J. M. Moore: I suggest that you determine the time, as that may help determine the place.

F. M. Thomas: I will not take advantage of my friend, Brother George Warren Brown. I was his guest recently in St. Louis. But with slight exceptions, the weather in Kentucky, and I suppose in St. Louis about the same, is delightful in the spring and in the fall. If we meet in Louisville, it will be in Fourth Avenue Church. The Sunday school room of that Church, which is admirable for a meeting like this, is cooled by electric fans, so that at any time you will find it adjusted to meet your needs.

Bishop McDowell: I suppose we have to go far enough forward to secure as nearly as possible a free period. I venture, therefore, to suggest for consideration two separate dates: one a date in the first week in May, which may possibly be too early.

J. M. Moore: That is the time of all our board meetings.

Bishop McDowell: That eliminates that. The other date is in the week beginning June 24. That is after our commencements are through for the most part and after yours are through. It seems about as clear a date as any and would give us sufficient time for the work of our standing committees. If that time threatens to be too warm there at Louisville or St. Louis, I am sure we can easily adjust our meeting for some other place.

J. M. Moore: I think that week would be satisfactory. Please propose a date.

Bishop McDowell: I propose Wednesday, June 27.

This date was adopted as the time for the next meeting of the Joint Commission.

A. W. Harris: I move that those who may determine the place consider Cape May, N. J.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There are beautiful places on Lake Michigan.

Bishop Candler: I dare say that the Commission of the Church, South, will appoint a committee on this subject, having learned that you have one. It seems to be a very good committee.

Bishop McDowell: When we arranged for this meeting, our business Commission conferred freely with Bishops Denny and Wilson, who stated that they were acting without official authorization.

Edgar Blake: I move that the place of our next meeting be referred to a joint committee consisting of the Chairmen and Secretaries of the Joint Commission.

A. J. Lamar: Why meet in any city? It is not the ideal place. You have resorts scattered all over this country where the conditions are equal to any place in any city and where you will have much better conditions, more quiet, and less disturbance for the transaction of business. I would suggest that that committee, if appointed, consider such places. For instance, in our country we have Hot Springs, Ark.; Sulphur Springs, Va., Lake Junaluska, N. C., etc. In your territory the same. You have various assembly grounds. I think also that this ought to be considered, that your location should be as central to the members of this Commission as possible. You know where the members live. You can figure almost to a mathematical certainty what place will be the most convenient for the Commission. I think the committee ought to be governed somewhat by these considerations.

Bishop Denny: At the Greenbrier White Sulphur Springs, in West Virginia, there are the very best conveniences that any commission would need; an ideal climate and an easy access. I hope those who have charge of the selection of the place will consider that place. It would be a most delightful place to meet.

The motion that the selection of a place be referred to the Chairmen and Secretaries of the two Commissions was adopted.

Ira E. Robinson spoke in favor of Greenbrier White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

Rolla V. Watt: Has there been any plan made for the distribution of work among the members of the Committee on General Reference? There has been no meeting of that committee. If we go away without arrangements, we shall be rather nonplussed.

Bishop Mouzon: Your subcommittee on the address to be issued to the Church is now ready to report.

To the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Greeting! We send you greetings in the name of our common Lord. Upon our coming together in the city of Baltimore we had before us the report of the Joint Commission adopted at Chattanooga in 1910, the report adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Oklahoma City in 1914, and also the report adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 205

Springs in 1916. It was agreed that the fundamental and the vital issues between us were the following: First, the General Conference and its powers. Second, the Jurisdictional Conferences, their number and their powers. Third, the status of the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the reorganized Church.

We rejoice to say that the Spirit of God has been with us. Our fellowship in Christ has been intimate and refreshing. Our discussions have been frank and brotherly. We have been of one mind and one heart in our purpose to advance the interests of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. It was believed that if agreements should be reached touching the three items mentioned above, with time and patience and with the help of the Holy Spirit the details of the plan for the unification of Methodism could be worked out.

We are happy to be able to report that we find ourselves in general agreement touching many of the questions involved. However, in view of the magnitude of these questions, it was manifestly impossible for us to reach final conclusions. For further consideration, therefore, we have referred these subjects to strong committees with instructions to present a detailed report at an early session of the Joint Commission, June 27, at a place to be hereafter determined. It is our fervent hope that the spirit of brotherly love and Christian fellowship so evident among us in all the deliberations of the Joint Commission may prevail throughout our Churches. And we earnestly call upon all our people to continue instant in prayer for the guidance and blessing of God upon the work so auspiciously begun.

On motion of Bishop McDowell, the report just read was adopted.

A. J. Lamar: It seems to me that we should have reported to our Churches the things that we have positively agreed on.

Bishop McDowell: I think the report is better as it stands. We can pass this with substantial unanimity. It is doubtful if we could thus pass much more or much less.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Shall it be understood that the committees after their organization shall report, through their chairmen, to the secretaries the organization, so that the matter can be entered upon the minutes?

This was agreed to by common consent.

Bishop Murrah: I move that we take a recess, organize committees, and then report.

John M. Moore: I suggest that the Committee on General Reference be read, in view of the fact that some committees were outside the room when the names of that committee were read.

This suggestion was complied with.

A recess was had, during which a picture of the Commission was taken.

At three minutes past one o'clock Bishop Candler took the chair.

Bishop Murrah: I will report that the Committee on Judicial Council has organized by electing Bishop Cooke as Chairman and Dr. Thomas as Secretary.

H. M. Du Bose: The Committee on Conferences met and organized, electing Bishop McDowell as Chairman and H. M. Du Bose as Secretary.

E. M. Randall reported the organization of the Committee on General Reference. Bishop Mouzon, Chairman; E. M. Randall, Secretary.

It was stated that the remaining committee would soon be in and ready to report its organization.

Edgar Blake questioned the necessity of keeping the entire Commission in session to hear the report of that committee, inasmuch as they could be authorized to report their organization to the Secretary for entry in the Journal.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That is for the committee to determine. It seems to me, brethren, that we ought to adjourn in good form.

The organization of the Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership was reported as follows: Bishop Cranstion, Chairman; J. M. Moore, Secretary.

Bishop Hamilton: How about our expenses? Where are the bills to be sent?

A. W. Harris: It was the understanding that you send them to me. I will take care of them and have the necessary approval of the chairmen and perhaps of the secretaries, and they will be sent in. There are here representatives of the press, and I move that Bishop Mouzon be authorized to furnish to the press a copy of the statement adopted this morning.

This motion prevailed.

On motion of Bishop Hamilton, it was agreed that the list of names constituting these several committees be also given to the press.

On motion of Bishop Candler, it was voted that the minutes be read and that then the Commission adjourn with proper devotional exercises.

Secretary Thomas read the minutes of the session just concluding, and, on motion, they were approved.

Bishop Cranston announced the hymn, "All praise to our redeeming Lord," which was sung.

J. M. Moore offered the closing prayer: We thank thee for this meeting and for the Spirit of the living Christ that has been made manifest here. We thank Thee for the spirit of brotherly love that has been so evident in everything that has been said and done. O God, we pray that thy blessing may be upon what we have tried to do. May the things that we have said, the things that we have proposed in our hearts, the resolutions that we have formed be for the consummation of this great desire of these two Churches! We pray, our Heavenly Father, that there may not be

any turning back, that there will not be lack of confidence, but that we shall be so led of the living God that we shall continue in this way until we shall have finished our work. We pray that thou wilt bless the members of this Commission individually. May they have the richness of thy grace and the fullness of thy love! May each of them and their families be kept as under the shadow of thy wing! Bless the two great Churches, our Father, that as they preach the Word of God and call men into thy great salvation they shall look upon each other as members of a great Methodism. And may the day speedily come when the gospel preached by these Methodist people shall become a ringing message to the people of our great land! May the work that we do be of such nature as to advance thy kingdom throughout the borders of this land and throughout the world! Bless us now, our Father, as we commit ourselves to thy keeping. Guide us by thy Spirit and uphold us in thy work. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The session closed with the doxology, and the benediction was pronounced by Bishop Candler.


Adjourned at 1:30 P.M.



PROCEEDINGS AT TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.

JUNE 27-JULY 2, 1917

14



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON
UNIFICATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL
CHURCH AND THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL
CHURCH, SOUTH, HELD IN TRAVERSE CITY,
MICH., JUNE 27-JULY 2, 1917.**

The Joint Commission on Unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, met pursuant to call in the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, Traverse City, on June 27, 1917. It was called to order by Bishop Earl Cranston as follows:

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Will the Commission come to order? I wonder if any of us here can start the hymn that has become quite popular, "Beloved, beloved, now are we the sons of God."

The hymn was sung as follows:

Beloved, beloved, now are we the sons of God,
And it doth not yet appear what we shall be;
But we know that when he shall appear
We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.

Hymn No. 208, "I love thy kingdom, Lord," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Before I call upon Bishop Candler to lead in prayer, may I read to you from His Book, Gospel of Micah, sixth chapter and sixth verse. Some of you have been kind enough to congratulate me this morning on having attained my seventy-seventh birthday. With strength from my childhood, reverence for God, and having for the most of my life aimed to be a servant of God and his Church, I would be more than ungrateful were I not deeply moved by a sense of God's goodness in having brought me thus far. And I do not think you will consider that I am seeking to draw attention to myself or to anything remarkable in my experience if I should use this occasion in the way of a testimony which I feel is due from me to him who has been my Father and Saviour and Comforter and Guide. During all these years when I have read this chapter I have been carried back to a crisis in my life. I joined the Church when I was twelve years old; tried to give myself to the ministry and thought I had done so at the age of nineteen; was a backslider at twenty-one because I was contending against the call of the Spirit of God; entered the army, came back home broken in health; continued service in the field in 1864 and considered myself no longer a member of the Church; re-united with the Church on probation in the summer of 1866, refusing to accept a letter when it was offered to me from

my old Church; at the end of my probation I was elected a local preacher along about Christmas time. And now in this chapter I will tell you what happened to cause my reawakening and final consecration. I had gone to spend the winter of 1865-66 at my wife's mother's, and our only child, my oldest boy, was taken desperately ill and lay for six weeks hovering between life and death. For years I had not been praying except in desperate straits. I had even spoken slightly of the religious professions of my neighbors. But God had a way to bring me home; my mother's prayers were to be answered. At midnight, every one being out and I being alone in charge of my dying boy, for he had not one chance in a hundred, I bethought myself of my past and what confronted me, of the insufficiency of my stay and support, of how God had given us the lad who had been the hope of my life. He was two and a half years old at that time. The fire was down in the grate, and he was lying by my side, lips and tongue swollen, panting for breath. I bethought myself of the old Book, and I got up and went to it and opened it at random, and this is what I read: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" If ever a sinner was arrested, I was. Then I read: "Hear ye now what the Lord saith: Arise, contend thou before the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice." All that the prophet had said was nothing to me. God was right after me. "Hear, O ye mountains, the Lord's controversy, and ye strong foundations of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with his people, and he will plead with Israel." Then this came to me: "O my people, what have I done unto thee? And wherein have I wearied thee? Testify against me. For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam." Of course all my shortcomings out of sin appeared before me. I had had my Moses, and I had been down into Egypt. "O my people, remember now what Balak king of Moab consulted, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him; remember from Shittim unto Gilgal, that ye may know the righteousness of the Lord. Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for

the sin of my soul?" And O, what a sermon was preached to me by the next verse! "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Could anything appear more reasonable? Was ever anything more direct? I looked at the boy, and I heard his breathing. I did not know what the morning might bring. I went on my knees, and I bemoaned my backsliding and my sins, and I told God that if he would spare my child I would preach the gospel. I do not want to tire you with this recital. It was an epoch in a man's life, and God was close to me. He heard my prayer, and he gave me answer; he gave me my boy. And thank God for such a son! Another came later, but he was taken away. That boy will travel across a State to hear me preach. I want to bear testimony that I have never seen a day when I could do without atonement. How any man can do without atonement I do not know. My life had been wrecked, my soul had been in the depths of despair a thousand times except for my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. O, the righteousness in him, the loving kindness in him! Nothing have I to say for myself. My life has been only half useful. It has not been what it ought to have been. And there is but little time—I do not know how much—to square accounts with God, and there is only one way, by confession, faith, and love. The last two or three years have been most precious years in my soul's experience. Now, brethren, I cannot go about this work without just a word personal as between ourselves. Sometimes I think I say things hurriedly, impulsively yet, old as I am. Sometimes I say things I do not take pains to explain or modify as I ought. Perhaps we all do that. If there is anything of that kind lying back in your minds, please do what God has done with me: let it go out in that on which we are all dependent for cleansing, the blood of Jesus Christ, and what he has done for all of us and what he means to all of us. [Voices: Amen.] His gentleness may make us all. Brother Candler, will you pray for us?

Bishop Candler: O Lord, our God, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! Thy glory is set above the heavens. Thou art glorious in majesty and power and in mercy bountiful. We adore thee for thy great glory and are grateful to thee for thy never-failing goodness. We are here this morning because thou hast had thought of us and had care for us, and we thank thee for the mercies that have guided us since the last assembly and which continue with us to this hour. More than for all the temporal blessings of life, we give thanks to thee for Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Saviour, who

from the loftiest heights of heavenly honor descended to the lowest depths of earthly shame that he might redeem our fallen natures. Make us to be prototypes of the divine nature and lift us up to dwell with him in heaven, where we find all spiritual blessing and whose sanctified spirit and whose voice doth reveal unto us all grace. It has condescended to stand at the door of the humblest heart, knocking and seeking admittance there that he may bless us. And yet with all this daily mercy we can make no defense for our wrongdoing. If we undertake to extenuate our faults, we but increase our guilt. Humbly and candidly and penitently we appear before thee and pray thee to forgive us in the name of him who has made atonement for us and brought salvation. Grant us the assurance of acceptance from him at this hour and pour into our hearts thy peace that passeth all understanding. We pray thee to guide us in our deliberations. Give us wisdom and patience and in all things clearness of vision, illumined by thy lamp. May we undertake the work before us with pure hearts and with open minds that may not cling resistlessly to our own opinions, but that may be able to see also the other side. Keep our candles bright and burning. Let the presence of the Son of Man be always with us, blessing by his presence. The more of his presence and guidance in our deliberation, the more of wise conclusions that may promote the prosperity of the Church. Lord, represent and advance thy kingdom in our own land and in all lands. May thy honor be our first care. In singleness of purpose may we walk before thee. Bless our families at home, our wives and our children; O Lord God, overshadow them and give them peace. Bless our Churches. May all things abound among them that make for peace and righteousness and the upbuilding of the kingdom of God. We pray for our country. Lord God of our fathers, who hast guided us all the years, lead us and bless us and so guide this great nation into the state where God is Lord and turn us aside from the dreadful state of a nation that forgets God. O God, bless all in authority under thee and over us, the President of the United States and all officials and public servants of whatever character. May they rule in thy fear and serve the people according to thy will, finish their course in joy and later lead on to eternal life. Give us the consciousness of thy special care and favor in this time of intranquillity throughout the earth. O Lord, let a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night guide us in these dark days. And we pray for all nations, even the forces we must oppose. O thou Prince of peace, walk among these troubled nations. Purge away from them their unholy aspirations and ambitions

whereby strifes and wars arise and bring them into brotherly union under the Divine Father and speak peace to all. Bless every one who is here this morning, and O bless thy servant, the venerated brother who presides over us. We thank thee for the story of grace he brings to us, and as thou hast guided him safely thus far, O God, continue to lead him to his journey's end, and so may we all be led through all the devious ways of life until we come to our Father's house.

All then repeated the Lord's Prayer.

Hymn 207, "The Church's one foundation," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I shall now ask Dr. Snyder and Dr. Downey to lead us in prayer.

H. N. Snyder: Our gracious Heavenly Father, we bring ourselves into thy presence this morning as thy children looking for help, light, and guidance. We are conscious we are thine, and we are also conscious that we cannot do anything aright without thee. We accept ourselves as thy servants conducting thy cause in the world. All the interests and plans we have are as nothing without thy help. Therefore we come to thee asking for thy divine presence to lighten the darkness of our ways. Help us to do everything that is before us. Give us one mind and one purpose in the cause of Jesus. Lead us, we pray thee, by thine almighty hand to conclusions that are right and just, not always conclusions that are ours, we ask in his name. Amen.

David G. Downey: We wait upon thee, O Lord, for guidance. Grant to us, we pray thee, the open mind and the sensitive spirit, so that we may be attuned to the voice and the suggestion of the Spirit of our God. Help us to know the mind of Christ. We are charged with high privileges and with grave responsibilities. We well understand our insufficiencies, and all our sufficiencies are of God. We pray thee that thou wouldest reveal thyself unto us and reveal unto us thy will and thy purpose. Bless the Church that we love and serve, the one Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We thank thee for the unity of spirit and the bond of peace, that inner unity which, after all, is the vital thing; and yet, O Lord, if it be thy will, we pray thee that thou wouldest guide us so that that inner unity may find expression in outward form. Grant unto us thy kindness and thy grace and thy wisdom and bring us to conclusions that thou wouldest have us come to through Christ. Amen.

"Praise God, from Whom All Blessings Flow" was then sung.

Bishop Candler: Mr. President, before we proceed to the regular business allow me a personal privilege on behalf of myself and all the members of the Joint Commission. Your brethren noted before the interesting experience you gave us that this is your birthday. We are very happy in the fact that you have

lived through all these years and have rendered such high service to American Methodism. We want to felicitate you on this anniversary and to express our affection and love for you; and we want to do it not only in words in your hearing, but we want to place in your hands some token of our loving regard. We did not know anything that was altogether more appropriate than that which we are about to present to you, not silver or gold, which you have never regarded and regard less as you have got hold of the Eternal Thing, but we present to you in the fullness of springtime in beauty and in perfume symbols and forms of life, and I beg on behalf of the Commission to present to you these flowers.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It has been about seven years since I came to Michigan to deliver a lecture and fell in love with the host that is here gathered. I have returned from year to year, and I have learned to believe—and Bishop Quayle and, I think, Brother Blake have also become witnesses—that there is no place in America superior, if there is any in the wide world, to this shore of Lake Michigan as a summer home or as a place of meeting for any summer gathering. You will not wonder at all the kindness I have toward you as a Commission. It occurred to me that you could be nowhere more comfortable than where I have had so much enjoyment of the air and the weather during these years of my advancing life. I do not know but that some of you have been ready to complain that you were brought so far, and I want to take this occasion to say just a word to you and through you to all the brethren—that, while the attractions of a newly opened country like this may not be so great in the work that man has done, there is always the testimony of God in the works of his own hands, and I know of no place where the goodness of God is more manifest than to the people who retire and want to rest and who travel far and pay large expenses for these privileges. And the flowers. O, heaven will be full of flowers. We are invited into the garden of the Lord. I often try to find my way there and catch the fragrance of his breath and the tenderness of his love and forget everything else, and I do not find it possible anywhere more than in this State of Michigan. This country abounds in the most beautiful wild flowers, and we gather great bouquets of them, and our churches are decorated with them continually, so that wherever I go I am almost inclined to think that the wild flowers somehow bear testimony a little different from those we cultivate. Having upon them only the hands and in them only the breath of God, they give us blessed visions of God's goodness to us. I know that we who love each other in Christ Jesus cannot allow these occasions to pass by without some token by which we recognize our common brotherhood and common hope in him.

by whom we are made one. My thought goes out to Bishop Hoss this morning and to what he is doing, afflicted in himself, as we all know, and in the serious illness of his wife. It seemed to me he never was more genial or more thoughtful than in the meeting in Baltimore. I have been meeting with him once or twice a year for many years now, and I am sure we shall all be willing to hear Bishop McDowell say a few words in the way of a short prayer for Bishop Hoss.

Bishop McDowell: The Committee on Procedure has made a slightly different arrangement. At the conclusion of the report of that Committee I shall ask Bishop Hamilton to say a few words concerning Bishop Hoss.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I was not advised as to that, and the matter can take that course.

Bishop Hamilton: I had expected that we would have the roll call and then, when the absence of Bishop Hoss was noticed, to take that occasion to follow the order of the Committee on Procedure. I can speak with profound sincerity and with great conviction. This vacant chair belongs to a brother whom I have known for more than twenty-five years—yea, nearly thirty years. I have been associated with him in almost every effort at union; and I can say that, while we have differed many times, there never has been an occasion that I can recall in which a word of feeling, much less of anger, was ever expressed in our differences. He was more than simply one of our fifty when he was here and would be if he were here now. For he was a leader. He was preëminently a leader in his own branch of the Church, and he had come to be a leader in all Methodism over the world. I have not forgotten much of his biography, and I am quite old enough to go back to some of the early incidents of it. I recall that he was educated among us; and we all know that he was a spokesman for so many years of your Church, representing the views of the leaders in your principal paper, and some one said he was a local preacher in our Church. He was the representative of your Church in Canada, in England—

Bishop Candler: And in Australia.

Bishop Hamilton: And in Australia. His name has gone around the world, and I am sure I pay him just tribute when I say he has lovers in all our Methodism. Even from our brothers of color who have been associated with him I have heard expressions of such tender tribute to him in our meetings that it would not be right in the word I speak that I should forget them. He is not here. He is away, but on equally as high, if not higher and nobler, duties, and I know how to sympathize with him. Many years I did the same kind of watching and with nothing but the fateful hand in view. While we are here, he sits there watching by the bedside of one he loves and who he knows must

die, and die soon. I knew that he had been doing this for years, and then I learned that his own health was imperiled. I felt something of that when I heard him speak the last time with such tenderness as I had really never heard him express himself before. He spoke of the possibility of this being the last time he would be with us. I went up to him; and, lest he might think that any of our differences in previous years had interfered with our affection, I threw my arms around him and told him I never loved him more than I did then. Brethren, I believe we cannot only express our deepest sympathy, but certainly can join with Bishop Cranston, and possibly members of your Church, in prayer to God to give him Christian comfort and that he may bear what it is his experience yet to bear and, if we never meet again, that we may have in our memories most delightful remembrances of him. I move you, therefore, that we instruct the Secretaries of our Joint Commission to send Bishop Hoss an expression of our deepest sympathy and express also that we are about to engage in devoted prayer for him.

Bishop Denny: It gives me very great pleasure to second the resolution. Long personal relations with Bishop Hoss lead me to believe that few, if any, more loyal spirits exist among the living. I have often said to him that the man who wishes to take advantage of him is the man who begins by roundly abusing him, then by appealing to his magnanimity, and Bishop Hoss has never failed to surrender under such an attack as that. Bishop Hoss feels and has written some of his colleagues expressing his great regret that he has been compelled to refrain from coming to this meeting at this time; but not only the condition of his wife, but his own condition renders it impossible for him to come. He assures us in this communication of his deep interest in the meeting, of his love for us, and of his regret that once in his life he has not been able to meet an obligation that the Church has laid on him. I take pleasure in seconding the motion of Bishop Hamilton.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Let us give expression to our wishes by rising, after which Bishop McDowell will lead us in prayer.

The motion was carried unanimously by a rising vote.

Bishop McDowell: Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the good fellowship we have in this one matter in Jesus Christ, thy Son. We thank thee for that deep and abiding personal affection that is utterly without dependence upon agreement of judgment, but covers all differences with love and confidence and respect and abides through changing years unchanging. Lord God, we thank thee, and as we grow older more we thank thee for the personal relationship we have in Jesus Christ. And now we stand here a moment together to offer our sincere

prayers, our earnest prayers, our loving prayers in behalf of our brother whom we love. Lord God of mercy, Lord God of kindness, Lord God of strength, Lord God of helpfulness, Lord God of comfort, be with Bishop Hoss this day and all the days and with those who are nearest and dearest to him, that together they may share the full measure of that which is an abundant grace which is in Jesus Christ our Lord. And as we stand here thinking of him, thinking of the purpose that brings us together, thinking of the cause that has called us here, we pray thee that thou wilt guide us in our efforts to find the way for closer fellowship, not simply among us individuals, but for a closer fellowship and union between us as Churches. We are not anxious to find ways by which we can stay apart. Thinking of those who have gone, thinking of those who remain, thinking of the days that have gone, and thinking of the days that remain, we ask thee out of our hearts, O Lord God of light and life, help us to find the way together. Lord God, lead us in this hour. Lord God, take possession of our minds and hearts. Have thy way, whatever thy way is, with us and with the world, with the great, big, mad world. O Lord God, have thy way. As we are praying for the individual whom we love we pray also for that world which he loves also and we ask thee, in blessing him, to bless it with abundant blessings, to-day and evermore.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Brethren, if He cannot have His way with us in the quiet and freedom of communion and reflection here, how shall He ever have His way with this sin-mad, war-cursed world? It behooves us to think about that. Has the Committee on Procedure any report to make?

Bishop McDowell : I will ask Dr. Blake to read it.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Perhaps it would be well to have the roll call first.

Bishop McDowell (who alone was inside the circle of tables) : Before we have the roll call may I say to the brothers who are outside of this comfortable enclosure—it is very pleasant inside here, and I am somewhat lonely—may I ask some of the nice gentlemen, Dr. Ivey and his friends, to come in? The water is fine.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We will now have the roll call.

The roll was called, and the following were present : From the M. E. Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Reverends Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. West, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, J. W. Van Cleve. Laymen: G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, William Rule, Alex.

Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt. From the M. E. Church, South: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Reverends Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now we will have the report of the Committee on Procedure.

Bishop McDowell: I will ask Dr. Blake to present the report. Bishop Denny was not able to be present, and I acted in his absence.

The report was read by Dr. Blake, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND PROCEDURE

We recommend that the several committee reports be received and read in the following order:

1. Committee on Other Conferences.
2. Committee on Judicial Council.
3. Committee on Status of the Negro Membership.
4. Committee on General Reference.

We recommend that when these reports are taken up for consideration they be considered in the foregoing order.

We recommend that the afternoon of this day be set apart for separate meetings of the two Commissions.

EDGAR BLAKE, *Secretary*.

Dr. Blake: I move that the recommendations of this report be adopted.

The motion was seconded by several and, being put to a vote, was unanimously carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The first report in order is the report of the Committee on Conferences.

Bishop McDowell: The report of the Committee on Conferences is in the hands of the Secretary, and I think he has copies for the members of the Commissions. Am I right?

H. M. Du Bose: I think we have a copy for each member of the Commission.

Bishop McDowell: And Dr Du Bose will present what has been tentatively agreed to by the Committee as the result of its deliberations. We present it as a basis for consideration and action on the part of the Joint Commission.

H. M. Du Bose: In the meantime an explanation is in order. There are two reports, one from the Committee on General and Regional Conferences and one from the Committee on Other Conferences. Our stenographers had to make this up in two sections. The report of the Committee on General and Regional Conferences is ready. The report of the Committee on other

Conferences will be made later. I put them in the order in which they are to be read. You may find some slight errors in the arrangement, but these can be easily corrected.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : These were just subcommittees.

H. M. Du Bose : Yes. They were reports from subcommittees, but adopted by the General Committee, which made one report.

The report was read, as follows :

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON OTHER CONFERENCES

ARTICLE I.—PASTORAL CHARGES

The membership of the Church shall be divided into local Societies, one or more of which shall constitute a pastoral charge.

ARTICLE II.—CHURCH CONFERENCES

A Church Conference, composed of all the members of the local Society and resident members of the Annual Conference and such others as the General Conference may prescribe, shall be held at such times and places as the Church Conference shall decide. It shall elect such a number of delegates to the District Conference as may be fixed by the General Conference.

ARTICLE III.—QUARTERLY CONFERENCES

A Quarterly Conference shall be organized in each pastoral charge and shall be composed of such persons and have such powers as the General Conference may determine.

ARTICLE IV.—DISTRICT CONFERENCES

There shall be held annually in each district of the Annual Conference a District Conference, to be composed of the traveling, superannuated, supernumerary, and local preachers of the district, of delegates from the Church Conferences, and of such other members as may be designated by the General Conference.

ARTICLE V.—ANNUAL CONFERENCES

The traveling preachers, together with one layman from each pastoral charge, shall be organized into Annual Conferences, with such privileges and duties as are hereinafter provided for. One lay representative of a pastoral charge shall be elected by the Church Conference, except, where there are two or more Church Conferences in one pastoral charge, one lay representative shall be elected by the Quarterly Conference of the charge.

ARTICLE VI.—REGIONAL CONFERENCES

SECTION 1. There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference:

(1) Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, inclusive.

(2) Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and North Carolina, inclusive.

(3) Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, inclusive.

(4) Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, inclusive.

(5) Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota,

222 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, and Alaska, inclusive.

(6) Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, inclusive.

Members

SEC. 2. Each Regional Conference shall be composed of one ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference of its jurisdiction for each five thousand Church members in full connection or fraction of two-thirds thereof. The numerical basis of representation may be changed by any Regional Conference, provided that no Regional Conference, after its first session, shall be composed of less than two hundred and fifty or more than four hundred ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers. Each Annual Conference shall be entitled to at least one ministerial delegate and one lay delegate in its Regional Conference. The ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual Conference, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members of the Annual Conference.

Ministerial delegates to a Regional Conference shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference for at least four years and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the Regional Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference which elected them.

Lay delegates shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least five years and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the Regional Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference which elected them.

An Annual Conference may elect reserve ministerial and lay delegates not exceeding three each and not exceeding the number of its delegates.

Each Regional Conference shall be the judge of the election, return, and qualification of its own members.

Powers

SEC. 3. Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction, and in the exercise of said power it shall have authority as follows:

(1) To elect the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference and to direct and control their activities within its jurisdiction. Such bishops elect shall be consecrated at such time and place as the General Conference may direct.

(2) To direct and control its benevolent organizations, enterprises, and institutions.

(3) To direct and control its educational enterprises and institutions.

(4) To direct and control the local Church press within its jurisdiction and to elect the editors of the same.

(5) To fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions within its jurisdiction and to provide for the organization of the same.

(6) To promote the spiritual and temporal interest of the Church within its jurisdiction.

(7) To provide for the administration of the Discipline within its jurisdiction.

(8) To make rules and regulations for such other local affairs as are not herein mentioned.

Provided that no Regional Conference shall make any rule or regulation contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the

General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

Meetings

SEC. 4. Each Regional Conference shall meet on the first Wednesday of May, 1920, and thereafter on the same day and month every second year at such place as the Regional Conference may determine.

Special sessions of a Regional Conference shall be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

Presiding Officers

SEC. 5. The effective bishops resident within a Regional Jurisdiction shall preside over the sessions of the Regional Conference as the bishops themselves may determine.

Quorum

SEC. 6. Whenever a Regional Conference is in session it shall require the presence of two-thirds of the whole number of delegates to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a less number may take a recess or adjourn from day to day or approve the journal at the final session of the Regional Conference.

Voting

SEC. 7. (1) The ministerial and lay delegates shall deliberate as one body and, except as otherwise provided, shall vote as one body by a show of hands; but each delegate shall have the right to have his vote or refusal to vote recorded by name on the journal.

(2) One-fifth of either order of delegates present and voting may require a vote by orders, in which case it shall require the concurrence of the two orders to adopt the matter under consideration, except as herein-after provided.

(3) One-half of those present and voting may require that a "Yea" or "Nay" vote be taken, in which case the chairman of each delegation, when called, shall announce the vote of his delegation and at the same time shall hand to the secretary the names of those voting for and against the proposed measure, and they shall be recorded in the journal accordingly.

ARTICLE VII.—MISSIONARY REGIONAL CONFERENCES

SECTION 1. There shall be the following Missionary Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Missionary Regional Conference:

(1) Eastern Asia, including China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaya.

(2) Southern Asia, including India and Burma.

(3) Europe, including Africa.

(4) Latin America, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

Area and Boundaries.

SEC. 2. The privileges and powers of each of the Missionary Regional Conferences and the conditions of membership therein shall be determined by the General Conference.

ARTICLE VIII.—THE GENERAL CONFERENCE MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. (1) The first session of the General Conference shall be composed of one ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference for each twenty-five thousand Church members or

224 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

fraction of two-thirds thereof. The numerical basis of representation may be changed by the General Conference, provided that the General Conference shall be composed of not less than five hundred nor more than seven hundred ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers. Each Annual Conference shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay delegate in the General Conference. The ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual Conference, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members of the Annual Conference.

(2) Ministerial delegates to the General Conference shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference for at least four years and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the General Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference which elected them.

(3) Lay delegates shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least five years and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the General Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference which elected them.

(4) Each Annual Conference may elect reserve ministerial and lay delegates not exceeding three each and not exceeding the number of its delegates.

(5) The General Conference shall be the judge of the election, return, and qualifications of its own members.

Powers

SEC. 2. Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, the General Conference shall have full legislative power over all matters distinctly connectional and in the exercise of said powers shall have authority as follows:

(1) To define and fix the conditions, privileges, and duties of Church membership.

(2) To define and fix the qualifications and duties of elders, deacons, local preachers, exhorters, and deaconesses.

(3) To define and fix the powers and duties of District, Quarterly, and Church Conferences.

(4) To define and fix the powers and duties of Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions.

(5) To define and fix the powers and duties of Regional Missionary Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign the bishops to the same.

(6) To divide, consolidate, and change the Regional Conferences; but it shall not take away territory from any Regional Conference without its consent, save by the concurrent vote of two successive General Conferences; nor shall it create any new Regional Conference with less than five hundred thousand members in full connection.

(7) To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy; to fix the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences and to retire the same.

(8) To alter and change the hymnal and ritual of the Church and to regulate all matters relating to the form and mode of worship.

(9) To prescribe the method of acquisition, control, and disposition of the real and personal property of the Church and of all its branches.

(10) To govern the judicial administration of the Church, except as herein otherwise provided.

(11) To consider and, if deemed wise, to disapprove of the decisions of the Judicial Council upon any constitutional question and to require

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 225

its submission to the members of the Annual Conferences, the decision of a majority of whom, present and voting, shall be final thereon.

(12) To control and direct all connectional, publishing, missionary, benevolent, and educational enterprises of the Church.

(13) To govern any and all other matters of a connectional character.

Restrictions

Provided: (1) That the General Conference shall not revoke, alter, nor change our Articles of Religion nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

(2) The General Conference shall not change nor alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away with episcopacy nor do away with an itinerant general superintendency.

(3) The General Conference shall not revoke nor change the general rules of our Church.

(4) The General Conference shall not deprive our ministers of the right of trial by the Annual Conference, nor by a selected number thereof, nor of an appeal; nor shall it deprive our members of the right of trial by a committee of members of our Church, nor of an appeal.

(5) The General Conference shall not appropriate the produce of the Publishing House or Book Concern nor of the Chartered Fund to any purpose other than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, and superannuated preachers, their wives, widows, and children.

Meetings

SEC. 3. (1) The General Conference shall meet in the month of May once in four years perpetually at such time and place as shall be fixed by the preceding General Conference or by a commission to be appointed quadrennially by the General Conference, and the Commission shall have power to change the place, a majority of the general superintendents concurring.

(2) The general superintendents may, by a majority vote, and shall when requested by a majority of the Annual Conferences, call a special session of the General Conference.

(3) When the time for the opening of the General Conference has arrived, one of the general superintendents designated by the Board of Bishops shall take the chair and conduct the opening devotions of the session. Following the devotions, he shall direct the secretary of the preceding General Conference, or in his absence one of his assistants, to call the roll of the delegates elect. The general superintendents, before the General Conference convenes, shall elect from their own number one bishop, or not more than three, to preside during the session. The General Conference, upon organization, shall elect such other officers as shall be necessary.

Voting

SEC. 4. (1) The ministerial and lay delegates shall deliberate as one body and, except as otherwise provided, shall vote as one body, by a show of hands; but each delegate shall have the right to have his vote or refusal to vote recorded by name on the journal.

(2) One-fifth of either order of delegates present and voting may require a vote by orders, in which case it shall require the concurrence of the two orders to decide the matter under consideration, except as hereinafter provided.

(3) One-half of those present and voting may require that a "Yea" and "Nay" vote be taken, in which case the chairman of each delegation, when called, shall announce the vote of his delegation and at the same

time shall hand to the secretary the names of those voting for and against the proposed measure, and they shall be recorded in the journal accordingly.

(4) Whenever a majority of each of the two Regional delegations shall so request, a vote shall be taken on any pending motion or resolution by Regional delegations, and it shall require the concurrence of a majority of the Regional delegations, the members thereof voting as one body, to adopt said motion or resolution; provided, however, that no motion or resolution shall be adopted that does not receive also a majority vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting.

Quorum

SEC. 5. Two-thirds of the members elected to the General Conference shall be necessary for a quorum; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and at the final session may approve the journal, order and record the final roll call, and adjourn.

ARTICLE IX.—AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. The recommendation of two-thirds of all the members of the several Annual Conferences present and voting shall suffice to authorize the next ensuing General Conference by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting to alter or amend any of the provisions of this Constitution, excepting Article —; and also, whenever such alteration or amendment shall have been first recommended by a General Conference, by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting, then so soon as two thirds of all the members of the several Annual Conferences present and voting shall have concurred therein, provided that such concurrence shall take place previous to the meeting of the next ensuing General Conference, such alteration or amendment shall take effect, and the result of the vote shall be announced by the general superintendents.

Henry Wade Rogers: On page 9, subsection (11) of this report there is some language I do not quite understand. I shall be glad to have it explained. Subsection (11) reads:

To consider and, if deemed wise, to disapprove of the decisions of the Judicial Council upon any constitutional question and to require its submission to the members of the Annual Conferences, the decision of a majority of whom, present and voting, shall be final thereon.

H. M. Du Bose: It would not be out of the way right here to have Dr. Blake or some member of that subcommittee to explain that. My understanding was that it was to provide for supervision.

Henry Wade Rogers: It is badly expressed. Does that mean that the action of the Judicial Committee is set aside?

H. M. Du Bose: Evidently that is the intent, but Bishop McDowell will explain that.

David G. Downey: It is a sufficient answer to Judge Rogers's very proper question to say that we recognized that this paragraph would run across the same territory as some of the reports of the Committees on Judicial Procedure and Judicial Council; and it was thought, without an accurate determination at this

point, we should put in a paragraph of this kind to determine the whole matter until after the reports of the other committees were in, and then we could harmonize any statement that might be made.

Henry Wade Rogers: I was just wondering what was meant.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brethren, you will, of course, in the consideration of this report, as of every other, necessarily take up the language of every item as you come to it. We cannot spend an indefinite amount of time making comments as we go along. This completes your report?

H. M. Du Bose: This is our complete report.

Bishop McDowell: It was the recommendation of the Committee on Organization and Procedure which was adopted by the Commission that these reports should all be presented. It was our thought that after the reports were all in, if any statements were necessary and we had time for it, we might do it before the separate sessions; but inasmuch as the reports should all be first presented, the report of the Committee on Judicial Council is next in order.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then it is the idea to present all the reports before there is any discussion on any of them?

Bishop McDowell: Yes, sir.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then the report of the Committee on Judicial Council is the next report.

Bishop Cooke: The Committee is ready to report, but there has not been sufficient time to get enough copies for distribution. The report is very simple, however, so that there will be no difficulty on the part of any member in carrying the whole of it in his head.

The report was read by Dr. Thomas, as follows:

THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

I. TITLE PURPOSE

There shall be a Court of Appeals to be known as Judicial Council, whose decision shall be final except as otherwise provided.

2. COMPOSITION

It shall be composed of two members, one lay and one ministerial, from each Regional Jurisdiction, and — members elected by the General Conference.

3. ELECTION

The lay and ministerial members from the Regional Conferences shall be chosen by their respective orders at the session next preceding the General Conference, said election being by ballot. Said members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference.

4. TERM OF SERVICE

Members of the Council shall serve for four years, subject to reëlection. Except in the case provided in Section 10, the term of service of each

228 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

member shall expire at the close of the General Conference succeeding that at which his term began.

5. ELIGIBILITY

Lay and ministerial members of the Council shall not be eligible to membership in the General or Quadrennial Conference, nor shall they hold any other connectional office nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during such term. No members of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined.

6. ORGANIZATION

The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election and shall organize after their confirmation by the General Conference by choosing from their number by ballot a President and a Secretary for the ensuing quadrennium. In the absence of the President at any meeting of the Council they shall elect a President *pro tem*. The Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all proceedings, records, and documents in each and every case coming before the Council, with the decision and reason for the same in every case, and shall report such decision to the parties involved and also to the succeeding General Conference.

7. POWERS

The Judicial Council shall have full power to review on appeal on constitutional grounds the acts of the General and Quadrennial Conferences, the records and documents transmitted to it from Judicial Conferences, to hear and determine questions of law and all other appeals coming to it in course of lawful procedure from Annual Conferences, from Judicial and Quadrennial Conferences (hereafter to be provided), and from the General Conference, *provided* that no appeal from any Conference shall be entertained unless the same is signed by at least one-fifth of the Conference. In all cases the decision of the Judicial Council shall be final.

Provided that, if on a constitutional question there shall be a majority vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting disapproving a decision of the Judicial Council, the question involved shall then be sent to the Annual Conferences for final decision, as provided in Section —, Article — of the Constitution.

8. GOVERNMENT

The Judicial Council shall prescribe rules and regulations for its government and methods of procedure for the hearing and disposition of appeals, which rules and methods shall be printed in the Discipline and shall not be changed or altered during the quadrennium without due notice.

9. QUORUM

— members of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, and in no instance shall the Council hear or determine any case without such quorum.

10. MEETINGS DURING QUADRENNIUM

The Judicial Council shall meet at the same time and place as the General Conference and shall continue in session until final adjournment of the General Conference; *provided* that, if during the session of a General Conference the appeal of a bishop who had been tried for any disciplinary offense is pending, the Judicial Council shall defer its time of adjournment until it disposes of said appeal.

The Judicial Council shall convene during each quadrennium at such times and places as it may deem necessary to hear and determine appeals coming to it by lawful procedure from Quadrennial, Annual, and Judicial Conferences in the several Jurisdictions.

II. VACANCIES

Vacancies shall be filled by the Council from the same order, lay or ministerial, and Jurisdiction in which the vacancy occurs until the next meeting of the Quadrennial Conference of that Jurisdiction.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Under the rule, the reading completes that matter for the time being, and the next report is in order.

Bishop McDowell : The report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church is the next report in order.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Now, just a word about this report : The Committee has only had opportunity to have one meeting prior to coming here. On arrival here, and it was not to be wondered at, we found some of the members of our Committee were not present, and, indeed, they did not all arrive until last evening. The Secretary will present to you the report that was agreed upon late last evening, and Bishop Denny gave the Committee notice that he would bring in a minority report. With this brief explanation, the Secretary of the Committee will present the report.

The report was read by Dr. John M. Moore, as follows :

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STATUS OF THE NEGRO MEMBERSHIP

Your Committee on the Status of the Negro in the reorganized Church recommends that the reorganization of the Church be consummated in the following manner, so far as it relates to the status of the negro. Certain features of these suggestions, it will be observed, touch matters that have been referred to other committees and are presented herein only to show our idea of the complete correlation of the general proposition :

PROPOSITION ONE

1. The adoption of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, according to their respective constitutional methods, of a Basis of Union and a Constitution for the reorganized Church.

2. The adoption and promulgation of a Discipline for the reorganized Church by a representative body composed of equal numbers from the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, safeguarded by the right to vote separately and the requirement of a concurrent majority on all questions so taken.

3. The Discipline so adopted to be subject to modification by any of the coördinate bodies composing the reorganized Church as hereinafter provided.

PROPOSITION TWO

That the general legislative powers of the reorganized Church be vested in a General Conference and Associated General Conferences, with

such powers as shall be granted to them in the Constitution and which shall be after the following outline:

1. The General Conference shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions not embraced within the jurisdiction of any of the Associate General Conferences. It shall have power to legislate for the said Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, subject to the Constitution of the Church and to the action of the General Judicial Conference.

2. There shall be Associate General Conferences as follows: An African Associate General Conference, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions composed of persons of African descent in the United States and upon the continent of Africa; a European Associate General Conference, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in the countries of Europe and those in Africa not included in the African Associate General Conference; an Associate General Conference of Eastern Asia, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in China, Korea, and Japan, should Japan desire to enter into such connection; an Associate General Conference of Southern Asia, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in India, Malaysia, Borneo, and the Philippines; and an Associate General Conference of Latin America, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in Latin American countries or composed of Latin-American people in the United States.

3. The Associate General Conferences shall have authority to legislate for the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions embraced within their several jurisdictions, subject to the Constitution of the Church and the action of the General Judicial Conference.

PROPOSITION THREE

That there shall be a General Judicial Conference, composed of three ministers and three laymen from the General Conference and one minister and one layman from each Associate General Conference and two additional members, one minister and one layman from each Associate General Conference and the General Conference for each five hundred thousand members of the Church.

(To be suggested to the Committee on Judicial Council:)

That the General Judicial Conference shall have power to pass upon legislation enacted by the General Conference or by any of the Associate General Conferences. Any enactment which shall be disapproved by the General Judicial Conference by a majority of two-thirds of those present and voting shall be suspended until the next ensuing meeting of the body by which it was passed, when, if it shall be passed by that body by two-thirds of those present and voting, it shall become a law for the constituency of the body so passing it, except that any enactment disapproved on constitutional grounds cannot afterwards be passed through any but the regular constitutional process.

Bishop Candler: Will you tell us how many this third paragraph will make in the General Judicial Conference.

John M. Moore: About forty.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, I want you to hear Dr. Van Cleve, who was the author or representative of the Committee in preparing the report.

John M. Moore: He was the Secretary of the Subcommittee.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I shall not take time to explain how this report comes in this shape. In this shape it commanded the assent of a majority of the Committee, and I think it would only be fair before passing the minority report to let Dr. Van Cleve explain how in this-concrete way in its proposed environment the matter of the status of the negro is made to appear. It was one thing to put it baldly and another to put it down as a majority—

Bishop McDowell : I rise to a question of order. The order was that all reports should be just presented, and the two reports preceding this one were handled in that way.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : You are right. Bishop Denny will now present his Minority Report.

Bishop Denny : I regret that I have not had time to put this in proper shape; and I fear that, while the report presents the idea I had in mind, the English of it may admit of some improvement, and I shall ask the privilege of putting it in good English later on. Perhaps you will allow me to put behind my remark the statement of Wesley that no man ought to be above the use of good English.

Bishop Denny read the report of the minority of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church, as follows :

**MINORITY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS
OF THE NEGRO**

The report of the majority was passed by so narrow a margin, seven to five, that it seems unlikely it can command the approval of either of our Methodisms, and its recommendations are of such a nature that almost certainly it will result in divisive discussions and tendencies hurtful to both Churches.

In the judgment of the minority, the report of the majority does not solve the question involved. It is noteworthy that neither of the two negro members of the Committee, who may be considered to be representatives of the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which is the body of Methodists involved in the work of this Commission and whose interests are most vitally affected, voted for the majority report.

We have no reason to suppose that the report of the majority of this Committee will be acceptable to any branch of negro Methodists in America, and there are grave reasons to believe that it will be objectionable to all, especially to the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Moreover, the minority believes that this Joint Commission ought to keep definitely in mind not only the welfare of the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but the far larger interest of the greatest number of colored Methodists in other Churches and the yet larger number of unchurched colored people whom we should not ignore in any of the plans we may devise.

It must be constantly remembered that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church is no more than about one-fifth of the total number of colored Methodists in the United States; and from two of the best informed and most influential Methodist Episcopal members of this Commission, as well as from the published statements of one of the bish-

ops of that Church, we learn that, while there are eighteen negro Annual Conferences in the Methodist Episcopal Church in this country, only two of these Conferences, under the most liberal construction of the term, can be justly called self-supporting.

The most of the committee seemed to be agreed, and the report of the majority confirms this impression, that our colored brethren should not have a place in the legislative Conference of the whole membership; while the minority believe that our colored brethren should be formed into a separate organization coördinate with the reorganized white Methodist Church and having the same Constitution, Articles of Religion, ritual, catechism, and hymnal. By such a plan it is confidently believed they would be given the best opportunity to develop their religious life and ecclesiastical organization in harmony with the legitimate aspirations of their racial consciousness and would be afforded that independence of action without which no people has ever come to its best estate. This plan does not contemplate the setting off of our colored brethren in such sense as to deprive them of our assistance or to relieve us of our privilege and obligation to aid them in every practical and possible way, but it proposes to set them up into such a position and relation as will enable their white brethren to render them the most effective service. As an assurance that it is our purpose to continue a definite and close connection with our colored brethren, to sustain to them a coördinate relation, to establish a nexus between two Methodist Churches otherwise independent, we recommend the writing into the law of the Church of a guaranty that generous financial assistance shall be granted them on such a basis as may be liberal, equitable, and continuous, and in a manner wholly agreeable to them.

The majority report proposes to exclude our colored brethren from a place in the law-making body of the Church of the white membership, thus meeting a demand recognized to be a necessity, as it is a settled purpose and practice in a large portion of this country. But, in direct contradiction to this principle, this report admits them to a place in the supreme court of Methodism and thus makes it possible for them to determine the most vital questions touching our Church life. If they may not participate in the making of law, how can they be qualified acceptably to interpret and enforce law? To ask the question is to answer it. The exercise of judicial functions is often more influential, more delicate, than the exercise of legislative functions and requires far greater ability and commanding personal influence.

For these and other reasons the minority is of the opinion that the recommendations of the majority should not be adopted and that a separate organization should be set up for our colored brethren in which they would legislate for themselves and interpret their own legislation.

COLLINS DENNY,
H. H. WHITE.

John M. Moore: I rise to a question of personal privilege. The report of the minority shows that Bishop Denny, Judge White, Dr. Jones, and Mr. Penn did not vote for the majority report. There was a fifth man who did not vote for that report, and I am that man. I wanted to say this because it lets you all see where all of the Committee stood. I shall not discuss the report except to say that I found myself approving the underlying principles in the majority report, but I could not approve the form of statement, as it showed itself in so many features that I did not think we ought to bring it in in that way. I found

myself in sympathy with some of the features of the minority report, but there is a vast unexplored field in that report that we have not yet determined, and I did not feel that I could join in that report.

Bishop Leete: Without an inclination to debate the matter before us, I think it perfectly proper to dissent, which I wish to do merely as a matter of accuracy and without comment on either report, to the statement that "there are only two self-supporting negro Conferences." That is a quotation from an erroneous report, and I want this statement made lest it be forgotten.

Bishop Denny: Any statement as to a fact will be brought in conformity with the facts, and I shall be glad to get a statement as to the facts. I did not rely on any published statement. I relied more particularly on the statement of one of the best informed men in the Methodist Episcopal Church in making the statement.

Bishop McDowell: The Committee on Organization and Procedure did not pretend to prescribe what should follow the immediate presentation of these reports. It is now just a few minutes past twelve o'clock, and the Committee has nothing further to recommend at this time.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Committee on Reference has yet to report?

Bishop Mouzon: The Committee on General Reference has no report prepared. It was wholly impractical for that Committee to attempt to do anything until we proceed further with our business. We have not had any meeting, and we have no report.

Bishop McDowell: That is what I understood.

P. D. Maddin: Would it not be proper to have the minority report of Bishop Denny typewritten, so that we can all have copies of it?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is that the order of the Commission? If so, raise your hands.

Bishop McDowell: It is clearly now in the possession of the Joint Commission, and all that is necessary is for the Secretaries of the Joint Commission to see that typewritten copies are made of this minority report.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That order was taken somewhat informally, but it can now be registered as coming under Bishop McDowell's motion.

Bishop McDowell: And the same motion can be taken on the report of the Committee on General Council.

Charles W. Kinne: Bishop Denny said he wanted to make some corrections in his report, and I think he should be allowed to make these changes in the English of the report before it is printed.

Bishop McDowell: I think it was the intention of the Committee on Organization and Procedure that, after the presentation of the reports formally without comment, if time remained in the morning session, the chairmen or other members of committees should make any statement they wished to in the nature of an exposition of the report. It was not thought by the Committee that discussion of these reports should begin until the question of their adoption comes before the body, but at this time clearly such a statement as the Chairman of the Joint Commission asked to have made a moment ago would be in order if you desire to have it presented at this time.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think the real purport of that report of the Committee will not be apparent until such a statement is made. We realize that this report is not just in the proper shape in view of the relation of other committees to the work of this Committee, and we would like to have a statement on that. Then there are other reasons, and the Doctor should give them.

Dr. Van Cleve: I would rather state my conclusions and my relations with this from the beginning to the end when the matter is up for consideration and refrain from any statement now.

Bishop McDowell: Then, in accordance with the early recommendation, I move that we take a recess until to-morrow morning, allowing the Joint Commission to meet in a separate session this afternoon, in accordance with the order already.

Edgar Blake: You will withhold that motion for a moment. The matter of fixing the hours of meeting and adjournment of the Joint Commission should be attended to.

Bishop McDowell. I withdraw the motion.

Edgar Blake: Just for the sake of getting something before this body, I move that the hours for our sessions be from 9:30 to 12:30 for the morning session and from 2:30 to 5 in the afternoon. This is just arbitrary and made to bring the matter up before us.

Bishop Candler: Could we not get here by 9 o'clock?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no motion before the house. Dr. Blake's motion was not seconded.

Henry Wade Rogers: I will second Dr. Blake's motion.

Bishop Candler: Then I move to amend by inserting nine as the time for meeting in the morning. We are all busy men, and there are many other things calling us, and I take it that nine o'clock is not a very trying hour to as vigorous a body of men as we have here. For my own part, I am up at six o'clock, not out of any particular virtue, but because I cannot sleep; and in three hours I can get on all my clothes and eat what breakfast is offered me. I move to amend by making the meeting hour for the morning session 9 o'clock.

Frank M. Thomas: Does that leave the afternoon hours the same as in the motion of Dr. Blake?

Bishop Candler: We will fix the hour for meeting in the morning, and then we can take up the question as to the other hours.

Frank M. Thomas: You are throwing upon the Secretaries and the stenographers an enormous job; and if you do not give them time, they cannot do it. The facilities for getting type-writing work done here are not very great; and if you are going to be in continuous session, you cannot expect your secretarial work to be up to the standard or on time.

Bishop Candler: It would seem that we would save time by not having any afternoon session. Probably we had better leave the afternoon open for whatever we may decide to do as we go along.

Edgar Blake: I do not object to 9 as the meeting time; but if we fix 9 as the convening time, I think we should fix 12 as the adjourning time. With the work that the committees have to do, I think three hours is sufficient for the sitting of the Joint Commission. Therefore, with the permission of my second, I will change my motion that the time for sitting of the Joint Commission be from 9 to 12.

Bishop McDowell: 9:30 to 12:30 would be better.

Abram W. Harris: Three hours seems to me to be enough. If you meet at 9 and run until 12, you will have your three hours, but that gives the Secretaries very little time in the morning to do their work. I think from 9:30 to 12:30 would be better.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no motion except to have the hours from 9 to 12. Does any one desire to offer an amendment to that?

Rolla V. Watt: I offer as an amendment that we make the hours from 9 to 12:30. We can do a good deal of work in that extra half hour when we have started and are in running condition.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, we will just expedite matters by cutting out all the parliamentary technicalities. Those who favor 9 o'clock as the meeting time hold up your hands. Now those who favor 9:30. Nine is selected as the time for convening. Now those who favor 12 as the adjourning time indicate it. And those who favor 12:30. The adjourning time is 12:30 o'clock.

J. W. Van Cleve: I move that in the afternoon we meet at 2:30 and adjourn at 5.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that we defer action on the afternoon session until we see how we get along to-morrow.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : There was no second to the motion.

H. M. Du Bose : I would like to offer a resolution at this point. I will read it :

Resolved, That the Secretaries of this Commission be directed to prepare and send to the President of the United States a telegram expressing our sympathy with him in the great and crucial issues which have come to his hands and also an assurance of the loyalty which we feel for our country and which we know is held by our respective constituencies.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was unanimously carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We have had a delightful time this morning, and before we adjourn I shall ask Dr. Goucher and Dr. Ainsworth to lead us in prayer.

J. F. Goucher : O God, thou hast called us together to-day. Thou hast given us high ideals of Christ Jesus our Lord. We thank thee in this hour for the great and grave and precious responsibilities thou hast placed upon us. O God, we pray thee to reveal to us and through us by the Spirit the way of salvation for the higher world. We thank thee that the Church in which we have fellowship is not considering changes therein, but only ways and means whereby the teachings of Jesus Christ can be extended. And so we thank thee for that which thou hast revealed to us, and we pray thee that we may grow in grace and in wisdom and in vision and in the consciousness of thy Spirit. O God, may we glorify thee in all that we say and think and in the attitude of our spirit! And this we ask for the sake of thy dear Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

W. N. Ainsworth : O Lord God, we thank thee for the fellowship we have one with another and with Jesus Christ thy Son. We beseech thee that we may be conscious more and more each time we come together that this meeting is of thine appointment. May thy Son Jesus Christ appear among us as he did among those of olden times, and may our hearts be made to burn within us as we commune together! We pray thee that that Spirit which is the Spirit of truth may guide us unto all truth. May those conclusions be reached through our deliberations that will cement us together more and more in brotherly love and that will give new power and impetus to the movement of thy kingdom that looks to the conquest of the wide world for Jesus Christ! Hear us in our mortal prayers, and may we go hence with the consciousness that thine eye is upon us and that thy hand will lead us! we ask for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

Frank M. Thomas : We have copies of the Baltimore proceedings that have been corrected. After the printed copies were ready for binding, it was decided to print the names of the

members of the Commission in the forepart of the book. This was done very hurriedly, and Bishop Cooke's name was left out. There was also a mistake made in the address of Dr. Reynolds. We now have corrected copies; and if any one wishes to exchange his old copy with the mistake for a correctd copy, I shall be glad to accommodate him.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There are some other mistakes that have not been corrected. In that volume I am made to say certain things, and to the charge I plead not guilty. For instance, I am made to say that Bishop McConnell once said to me: "After I preached as well as I could and found myself reported in the New York *Herald* as having delivered an address on prize-fighting, I sent the report to the President, who had heard my sermon, and he said: 'If you are going to be a public man, you will have to take your medicine.' Bishop McConnell never made that address on prize-fighting. I made the address and sent a copy to President McKinley, who made the remark that a public man must take his medicine. This is simply a personal matter, but I want that corrected.

Bishop Hamilton: One of the brethren has called my attention to the fact that in this report Bishop Hoss made one of my speeches, and I made one of his, and my friend wanted to know how I came to be so suddenly converted.

F. M. Thomas: I am informed by our reporter that some shorthand writers write "McKinley" and "McConnell" exactly the same, and that was evidently a mistake by the stenographer, and when the typewritten manuscript was submitted to Bishop Cranston he did not correct the error. It was transmitted to me after it passed through Bishop Cranston's hands.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Bishop Leete will pronounce the benediction.

Bishop Leete: And now unto Him that is able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. And may grace, mercy, and peace from the Father and from the Son and from the Holy Spirit remain with us all. Amen.

MORNING SESSION, JUNE 28, 1917

The morning session was called to order by Bishop Hamilton, as follows: In order not to waste time we will begin the exercise by singing the hymn "Come, Ye That Love the Lord."

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): I shall now ask Dr. Thomas to lead us in prayer.

Frank M. Thomas: O thou Eternal God, thou who art every-

where, thou who art here in this beautiful Northland as well as in the dear Southland, in the East and in the West, and in all the islands of the ocean and all the vast spaces of this material universe, thou who art everywhere and thou who art able to make thyself felt everywhere, disclose thyself to us this morning as our Father. We thank thee that time and again thou hast spoken to us, that time and again we have felt thy presence, and that among our poor tired human spirits there has come the breath of divine life and the pressure of a Father's arms. And so we pray thee this morning, as we gather here as individuals and as representatives of our great Churches, that we may feel thy presence. We realize that we are helpless and unable to make one single step without thee, and yet we believe we are marching toward Zion, the beautiful city of God. We believe that our faces are set toward the morning and that in thy good time we shall arrive, bringing not only all the hosts of Methodists, but we believe in time all our humanity, battle-worn and blood-stained, will arrive, because thou hast arrived, O Father, in the person of thy dear Son. And O this morning we gather around our risen Lord still bearing in his glory the transfigured body that he once carried here on earth. We thank thee that this humanity of ours, so close at times to earth, so sunk at times in crime and covered by sin, is yet able at last to rise until it is worthy to sit near thy throne. O God, we pray this morning that we may have the vision of a redeemed universe. Help us this morning to have faith to believe that some day all things will be well in Christ Jesus. Help us to believe that it is our mission that thou hast called to us to reconcile American Methodism. Help us to believe that we can achieve it by thy presence and by thy power. Help us to believe that thou art with us now as in the past. Help us to believe that thou hast given all things in Christ and that Christ is able to overcome all the contradictions and limitations of human life and make all things again in thy image. O God, in this awful hour, when our beloved America seems predestined to lead all the nations of the earth to better and nobler government, help Methodism, which has made America, which has vitalized the very springs of American life with the life blood of its preachers and their families. O God, help American Methodism and guide us. We need thee. Thou art able to lead us, and we believe in thy Spirit. We believe in Jesus Christ, thy Son. We believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the blessed Trinity, without whose wise oversight we would be as nothing and to whom this vast universe must some day return in glory to be transfigured. Help us this day to set our faces toward the redemption of all things in Jesus Christ our Lord, in whose dear name we pray. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton) : We will sing the hymn "Jesus, Lover of My Soul."

During the singing of the hymn Bishop Cranston came in, and Bishop Hamilton resigned the chair to him.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : It is usual that the presiding officer of one day remain in charge of the session until the minutes are approved. I apologize for my tardiness, but my watch is twenty minutes late. We will now have the roll call.

Present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Reverends Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. DuBose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, William Rule, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt.

Bishop Candler here took the chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Please give attention to the reading of the minutes of the former session.

The minutes of the former session were read.

A. F. Watkins : I would like to call attention to the fact that in the reading of those present at the last session my name was omitted.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Let the error be corrected.

H. H. White : I do not want honors thrust upon me. I am not a judge. I prefer to be recorded as Mister.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : If there are no further corrections, the journal is approved.

Abram W. Harris : I have a telegram addressed to the Joint Commission from T. DeWitt Parker, Washington, D. C.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Read it.

The telegram was read.

Bishop McDowell : We adjourned last night in our separate sessions with the expression of a wish for the continuance of the separate sessions of our Commissions before resuming joint session. We instructed the Chairman of our Commission to confer with the Chairman of the Commission of the Church, South, to see if perhaps we might not go on with separate sessions this evening, even though we had adjourned to meet in joint session this morning. In order to test the sentiment of the house I move that we now take a recess until half past two, subject to the call of the Chairman, or until to-morrow morning.

A Commissioner: Subject to the call of the Chairman.

Bishop McDowell: I move that we take a recess, subject to the call of the two Chairmen of the Joint Commission, in order that we may have separate sessions of the two Commissions.

Edgar Blake: Before that is put can we have the report from the Committee on Judicial Council distributed to us, so that we can discuss it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Is that a motion?

Edgar Blake: It is.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop McDowell: Some question has been made as to when the joint session will be resumed.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I am quite sure it will not be before noon. We will now have the benediction by Bishop McDowell.

Bishop McDowell: Go with us now, O Lord, our Leader and Guide and Father, and grant us all the while thy presence and thy Spirit for mercy's sake. Amen.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Candler.

Hymn No. 222, "Jesus, the Name High over All," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Randall will lead us in prayer.

Edwin M. Randall: Our Heavenly Father, we are conscious of the greatness of the task that is before us. We are conscious of our own inadequacy to solve the problems with which we are confronted; but we are sure, Heavenly Father, that it is thy will that these problems shall be solved, and we remember that it is written, "If any man lack wisdom, he may ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not," and we assure thee, our Heavenly Father, that we are here a company of men who have learned to trust and love each other, to rejoice in their recognition of a mutual devotion to the accomplishment of thy will. We are here, Heavenly Father, knowing as far as our own consciousness is concerned that we can look up into thy face, Heavenly Father, and say, "Thy will be done." O show us thy will and show us how to attain it, and grant that we may become so sensitive to the leadings of thy Holy Spirit that it may unerringly direct us and where we are in doubt and perplexity we may be led better than we know and we may be brought to the fulfillment of thy glory and thy acceptable will. It may be that in the limitations of our understanding and in the imperfections of our judgment the divine plan, if presented to us, would not seem to be just the thing we want. But grant that that may be

the thing to which we shall attain and that, having been led by thee and each one with an eye single to thy honor and glory, having brought out in our deliberations the very best things that we may be able to produce, grant that, whatever misgivings there may be among any of us, it may be received by our people and that its wisdom may be so verified in its introduction and action that we may all rejoice and recognize thy presence and that the will of God is achieving results. And, O God, grant in this blessed fellowship which we have and in which we so greatly rejoice and love each other—grant that this mutual love and confidence may be such that at no moment may it be possible for any occasion to arise when our love and confidence shall fail and that we shall be enabled to go steadfastly forward, heart to heart, believing and trusting as brethren working under the influence and leadership of thy Holy Spirit with every condition under which we work such as shall be most favorable for the fulfillment of thy blessed will. And now, this afternoon, as we are gathered together here as brethren to consider some of these problems between us, be thou with us and let our hearts feel the joy of thy presence and the joy of fellowship with each other, and let us be conscious that thou art with us and thy heavenly wisdom. Let our faith be unwavering, that out of these deliberations there shall come that result which shall not only bring about within our two actions the fulfillment of thy will and the alignment of our mighty army to do the will of God, but that which shall be an inspiration to the whole world and which shall definitely bring nearer the day when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of God and the wisdom that cometh from thee. We ask it all in the name of Him who led that wonderful life and died that tragic and pathetic death that the things which we are here to accomplish might be done and that the world might come to thee. And now enable us with singleness of heart and full consecration to give ourselves to this purpose, we ask in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Commission united in singing the hymn "Rock of Ages."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Will Dr. Chappell lead us in prayer?

E. B. Chappell: We wait before thee, our Heavenly Father, for thy blessing. We trust that we come into this presence with openness of heart, with only this desire, that we may know thy will and that we may do it. If we are mistaken in this, our Heavenly Father, we pray thee that thou wouldest reveal us unto ourselves and help us to turn away from us everything that is dark and uncertain and cleanse thou us by thy gracious and Holy Spirit. Help us that we may be willing to learn, that we may be so pure in purpose and that we may be enabled to see

the truth, that we may hear the whispers of thy voice bidding us go this way or that way. And, O God, we pray thee that thou wouldest give us the courage to do the things that are right. Deliver us from all worldly ambitions; deliver us from every spirit of sectionalism, from the spirit of ecclesiastical pride. Thy Church is established in the world, not for its own glory, but for the upbuilding of thy kingdom, for the glory of thy name. O God, teach us this afternoon how we may unite our forces and utilize the resources thou hast given us that we may do the most good to bring about the glorious day when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of the Lord and he shall reign here upon earth. We pray thee that thou mayst help us to be earnest truth seekers, that we may not deceive ourselves by equivocation or evasion. And we pray thee that thou wilt give us a wide vision; and may we think not only of the things that are at our own doors, but may we think of our relations to the great problem of winning this world for Jesus Christ, of winning all men for Christ, of making Christians in all great relations and enterprises and activities! And we pray, our Heavenly Father, that in all our deliberations we may be so guided and governed as that the forces that thou hast made us responsible for shall contribute most to the desired end. Bless not only those of us who are here this afternoon, but bless the great multitudes of our Churches all over the land who are concerned about the things that we are considering and who are praying that we may come to wise conclusions. God, grant that they may also be wisely led in that they may accept the decision that has been reached after prayer and after deliberation, and then we trust in the providence of God, the decision that has been made here. We pray thee that thou wilt deliver us from anything like strife that will create hurt in the ranks on either side. We desire peace among all of us. We desire love and harmonious coöperation with one another. O God, we are staggered when we think of the difficulties and perplexities of the problems confronting us; and we pray for thee to guide us, we pray for thee to help us, we pray for thee to lead us that we may do only thy will, in Jesus's name. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): When we adjourned this morning we adjourned subject to the call of the Chairmen of the two Commissions. The Southern section adjourned not knowing there would be any afternoon joint session, and they were to continue at 3 o'clock. I was informed by Bishop Cranston that we would have a joint session a short time ago, and it is agreed that we should hear the joint call according to your order. I ask that the Secretary call the roll.

The roll call resulted as follows: Present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 243

Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Reverends Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. DuBose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, C. W. Fairbanks, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, William Rule, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Now, will the Secretary give us the minutes of the morning session?

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

Secretary Harris: I have a telegram signed "F. H. Coman, Buffalo, N. Y."

The telegram was read.

Bishop McDowell: I move that the Secretary be directed to acknowledge this communication.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

C. W. Fairbanks arose to a question of personal privilege and suggested to the members of the Joint Commission that it would expedite proceedings if the Joint Commission would go into Committee of the Whole.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You have heard the motion of Mr. Fairbanks.

Bishop Cranston: It was not a motion. The gentleman asked that by common consent we go into Committee of the Whole.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair would not feel free to let it go that way.

T. N. Ivey: I move that the Joint Commission go into Committee of the Whole.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop McDowell: For what purpose? Is it for the purpose of consideration of the reports of the committees before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): What is in the mind of the gentleman?

C. W. Fairbanks: I have in mind the consideration of any subject or report that the Joint Commission desires.

A vote being taken, the motion to go into Committee of the Whole was carried.

In Committee of the Whole

C. W. Fairbanks: I move that the present Chairman of the Joint Session be Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried, and Bishop Candler assumed chairmanship of the Committee of the Whole.

The discussion in the Committee of the Whole, under order of the Joint Session, was not reported stenographically.

At the conclusion of the discussion the Committee of the Whole, on motion, arose.

In Joint Session

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported to the Chairman of the Joint Commission that the Committee of the Whole had had under discussion various matters pending before the Joint Session and that progress had been made.

On motion of Edgar Blake, duly seconded, the Joint Session adjourned until to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock. It was dismissed with a benediction by Rev. Claudius B. Spencer as follows: "Our Heavenly Father, grant that each day we may begin, continue, and end our thoughts and labor in thee. Fulfill in us and through us thy high purpose for good; and may thy grace, mercy, and peace rest upon us and be upon all of thine Israel everywhere! Amen."

MORNING SESSION, JUNE 29, 1917

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Cranston.

Hymn 335 was sung.

Bishop Cranston relinquished the chair to Bishop Candler.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Bishop will read the Scripture for us and lead in prayer.

C. M. Bishop: I read a paragraph from St. Luke's Gospel following the story of the temptation:

14 And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and there went out a fame through all the region round about.

15 And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

16 And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

17 And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written,

18 The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.

19 To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.

20 And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.

21 And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.

22 And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son?

O thou Christ and God, we offer thee our worship as the Eternal Son revealing the Godhead to us, making known to us the eternal love of God and in his own person and by his own life opening up to us the way of return to God. O Christ, thou art our King, and thou shalt be our Ruler and our Lord, as thou art our gracious, loving, forgiving Saviour. We put our trust in thee and in that wonderful tenderness of thine revealed when thou wast among men, not only in the kindness which thou didst show to the suffering and troubled and downtrodden and poor, but also in the heartening message which thou didst bring to men when thou didst teach them anew and with clearer meaning to look up to God as the Father, to accept the place of a child in the home as they looked out over the world, to realize that over it all there ruled a power which was not only almighty, but that was directed by sympathy and tenderness which only a father can feel, and thou didst make men therefore to realize that in their earthly life they may go on hopefully and joyfully and bravely. Thou didst encourage them to believe that they might overcome temptation, and thou didst show them how to overcome it. Thou didst lead them through the months and years to a clearer and clearer understanding of God and all human life and of its higher meaning, so that at last they who have followed thee through the weeks and the months were themselves ready to go out to take the world for thee. O Christ, the living Christ, by thy Spirit renew our own faith. Lift us up into personal communion with thyself. Help us to walk these earthly ways with the sense of the divine companionship always strengthening our minds and strengthening our hearts. Help us to be consumed with zeal to carry forward the work which thou didst establish and which thou didst place in the hearts of thy disciples. Help us not to be afraid. Grant that we may not be confused in our minds or purposes, but that our single aim may be to go where the Master would have us go and do what he would have us to do. Be thou present here in thy Spirit in the hours of our labors during this day. Give us heavenly wisdom. Give us the spirit of complete consecration to Christ and his cause. May we labor together as a company of men whose chief business it is to do God's will and carry forward his work! And, laboring in this spirit, unconfused by poor, weak human designs and ambitions and selfish purposes, we may hope to achieve than in thy name which thou hast called us to do. God empower us for our task, and God give us comfort in our hearts, and God help us to make this a good day in the history of our Churches, we ask in Jesus's name. Amen.

Hymn No. 547 was sung, "Children of the Heavenly King, as We Journey Let Us Sing."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : We will now have prayer by Dr. Jones.

Robert E. Jones : Our Father in heaven, we worship thee this morning and pour out our hearts to thee in thanksgivings and in praise for all the kindnesses of thy love. We thank thee for the fellowship which we have with thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, our brother. We thank thee for redemption and for the hope of immortality. We thank thee that thou dost condescend to take us in fellowship with thee for the bringing of thy kingdom on earth as it is in heaven. Thou art God, thou art our merciful Father, and thou hast committed to us certain work in the fulfillment of thy purposes. Sometimes we fail to follow thy ways, and our hearts are closed to thy service and to that great love of thine that comes to us. But this morning we realize that sinners saved by grace, as we are, we are debtors for thy love, for the love that faileth not, for the love that will not let us go. O God, we come unto thee at this hour and pray that thou wouldest forgive us and that thou wouldest lead us into a larger and better life. Our Father in heaven, unworthy though we be, we thank thee for intrusting into our hands the management of thy visible kingdom on earth. Thou hast a purpose in it all. Thy will ought to be supreme. God, help us this morning to make thy will supreme, so that we may take thy thoughts, interpret thy will concerning us, and interpret thy will concerning us as relates to our fellow man; and may we have the spirit of Him whom thou didst send unto the world and who came in humility, self-denial, self-abnegation, and self-sacrifice and with the spirit of godly love! O God, our Father, may the love of Christ be reflected in our lives! May we sit at his feet! May we feel the throb of his heart! and may we be so like him that man may be so interwoven with him that we are his followers and that we are his disciples! O God, our Father, we pray thee this morning for the Churches we represent. We thank thee for all that has been accomplished during the history of these Churches, for all that the Wesleyan movement has meant to the world, for all that there is before us to-day in the bringing of this world to thy feet. We pray for our Churches this morning and for all the Churches of all the world. And, our Father, we pray for our country, for him who directs the affairs of the nation. O God, be with him in his troubled heart, in the mighty problems that rest upon his shoulders. Be thou with him, O Father, as he seeks to direct this nation in this awful conflict. We do not quite understand it all, but we pray that out of it all shall come great good to the suffering people of the world. O God, deliver, we pray thee, our brethren in Europe; and may they have love of liberty and may they have religious freedom and may there come out of it all unto them a realization of the presence of Christ

in their lives and that they may follow him in his ways! God, bless our nation to-day and bring us closer and closer together. May there be no warring element in this great republic of ours! May we all be Americans! May we all be children of God! And we pray thee that this nation may come to realize thy goodness and that we may soon come to the point where we may all have a clear sky and a firm footing. O God, may America be the schoolmaster of the world in teaching the world that it is to direct the affairs of government! So we pray, our Father, that our nation shall be strong in patriotism and strong in self-denial and strong in adherence to all our flag stands for. Bless, therefore, we pray thee, the men on the firing line. Be very good to those men recently landed on foreign soil. We pray not only for our country, but for the larger things of the world also, for those men who are willing to do for our country. And now bless us as we wait before thee. May there be no striving in our hearts other than the striving to know the mind of Christ. These blessings we ask in Jesus's name. Amen.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Brethren, I take a moment by way of privilege to say that there are two or three gentlemen in the ante-room who have come simply to give you a word of welcome, a recognition of our presence here, and I hope you will be willing to receive them and hear them. It will not take more than three minutes.

This permission was given unanimous consent, and the gentlemen, Messrs. Curtis, Miner, and Stephenson, were introduced.

Rev. Mr. Curtis: As pastor of the Central Methodist Church I want to express an apology for the apparently cold reception you received. We have had the impression, perhaps incorrectly, that this is a very exclusive body and that it was very meet and proper that we should make ourselves manifest by our absence. However, that does not cover this point, that our pastor was called away to attend a convention in the Southern part of the State and will not return until next Tuesday. We of the Church are feeling very proud that you selected us for the place of this dignified meeting; and if there is anything that we as laymen can do to make your stay pleasant, we hope that you will let us know what it is. We hope you will arrange to go with us on the ride to-morrow afternoon. I wish to express to you the high greeting of the Central Methodist Church for your body.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : You have a request, Mr. Stephenson?

Mr. Stephenson: I wish to express appreciation of this body's being in the city and feel that we should ask your pardon for not showing you greater courtesies. But we know something of the magnitude of the task you have on hand and are delighted

that you are here to discharge it. We wish we might have the privilege to have one of the bishops of the Church preach for us on Sunday night, and we shall leave it to you to appoint the one.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That matter has been referred to the Committee on Order and Procedure, and I trust it will be found easy to secure two preachers for this Church and two for Asbury, and I know we can find volunteers for any other service of the kind that is asked of us. I am not sure that I am responsible for the members of these Churches having appeared to be shy of our presence. I had expressed myself as to this meeting, how little time we would have for social hospitality. I think I did. I had that thought, and it is like me to express it, and the pastor of this Church has taken me at my word, and he has gone off. But we have the assurance of the brethren—we knew it, anyway—we knew that we were not unwelcome, but these brethren did not know what a good place Traverse City was to come to. I knew it and have known it ever since I laid the corner stone of this church. Now, go in peace with the blessing of the Lord, and we will attend to other matters.

Frank M. Thomas: The Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, desires to present a paper in answer to the request of yesterday afternoon.

The paper was read, as follows:

TO THE COMMISSION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL
CHURCH

Dear Brethren: On the assembly of the Joint Commission on yesterday, after the journal had been read and approved, at the request of an honored member of your Commission, the Commission on Unification went into Committee of the Whole to hear a proposal which you desired to submit to our Commission, and while in Committee of the Whole the proposal was presented to us in the form of the following inquiry:

"Resolved, That this Commission inquire of the Commission from the Church, South, whether that Commission would consent to consider the episcopal areas as the unit of Regional or Quadrennial Conference representation, with the understanding that bishops shall be nominated by such Regional areas, with such adjustment of powers in the Annual Conference as may be consistent with the accepted principle of reorganization."

In reply we can only say that we feel bound in this respect by the declaration of our last General Conference, which approved the tentative plan of the Joint Commission as set forth in the series of suggestions adopted at Chattanooga in May, 1911, and containing the following article:

"We suggest that the governing power in the reorganized Church shall be vested in one General Conference and three or four Quadrennial Conferences, both General and Quadrennial Conferences to exercise their powers under constitutional provisions and restrictions, the General Conference to have full legislation over all matters distinctively connectional and the Quadrennial Conferences to have full power over distinctively local affairs."

We therefore are compelled to regard the Regional Conference as a basic principle of a genuine unification of our Methodist bodies, and we cannot, in the light of the action of our General Conference, depart from this basic principle. Inasmuch as you informed us in the oral statement with which your request was accompanied that you yourselves had not reached any conclusion on this interrogatory proposal nor taken action on the report of the Subcommittee on Conferences, we have felt the more disposed to answer your inquiry with the utmost candor.

WARREN A. CANDLER, *Chairman*;
FRANK M. THOMAS, *Secretary*.

June 29, 1917.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We have been proceeding under the orders of the Committee on Organization and Procedure. I do not know what is the proper course right now.

Secretary Frank M. Thomas : The roll call has not been made as yet.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Secretary reminds me that the roll has not been called.

Secretary Abram W. Harris : I can make the roll up without calling it.

Bishop Cooke : I move that we dispense with the calling of the roll.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Secretary (Abram W. Harris) made up the roll of those present.

Henry Wade Rogers : I move that the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church be permitted to withdraw.

Bishop McDowell : Let us have some understanding that we shall adjourn subject to the call of the Chairman.

H. N. Snyder : I have a letter which I desire to read: "You will find inclosed a letter addressed to the Joint Commission which expresses the opinion of the negro members of this Church. I trust you may find opportunity to lay the contents before your Commission." I suggest that this be received and turned over to a Special Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church.

P. D. Maddin : Why not have it read?

H. N. Snyder : It is a long communication. It is from a colored member of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Spartanburg, S. C. It is a formal paper on the status of the negro in the reorganized Church.

Joseph W. Van Cleve : Is that sent individually, or is it sent from the Church?

H. N. Snyder : He says he sends it at the request of the Northwestern University, of Evanston, Ill., "setting forth my views."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Who signs it?

H. N. Snyder: Asa Thompson. I know the man, and he is a respectable member of the Church, and he claims to represent the Northwestern University.

The motion that the communication be received and referred to the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John F. Goucher: I rise to a matter of privilege. I would like to suggest, if it meets the approval of the gentlemen of the Commission, that on Sunday afternoon at five o'clock we shall hold a service of the Joint Commission for spiritual guidance. Last Sabbath those of the delegates who were here informally got together, and I think we all found it very profitable. May I say that in 1910, at the Ecumenical Missionary Conference, they appointed a committee which continued in existence until the death of the Ecumenical Council. At the meetings of that Conference, at Lake Mohawk, they always have services of this kind Sunday afternoon. The delegates have a fine heart-to-heart talk and prayer which has proved to be one of the most profitable services. I therefore move that the Chairman shall arrange services for five o'clock on Sunday, which service shall be exclusively for the Commission.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion of Judge Rogers is now before us.

Henry Wade Rogers: My motion was not seconded, and I desire to withdraw it. The Commission of the Church, North, had a session last evening to consider the report on Judicial Council, and we have come to an agreement among ourselves upon that subject, and I have been informed by Bishop Cooke that what we agreed upon last night has been copied in typewriting and is in shape so that we can present it. I did not know that this had been done when I made my original suggestion, and I now ask your consent from Bishop Cooke to present the agreement we reached on the Judicial Council, and we can then leave the discussion for some future time.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think we shall be very glad to have the report made to us by Judge Rogers; but we shall probably not be prepared to begin any consideration of it jointly, because our Commission has not yet reached it. I think, however, that we shall be glad to have their report brought in and have it before us.

Bishop Mouzon: I simply question whether we are proceeding in the wisest possible way. I am convinced that if we are to make progress the time has now come when as much of our time as possible should be spent together and not in separate conferences. I greatly fear lest by meeting separately we shall find ourselves drifting apart rather than together. I am quite sure, while the

Commission is entirely ready to have presented to it any conclusions that have been reached by our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church touching the Judicial Council, at the same time we do not know whether we are going to have any Judicial Council or not. It seems to me as soon as it is possible to do so we should take up the first report which has been presented to us; that we should not take it up seriatim, but that, first of all, we should take up the powers of the Regional Conferences; and whether we are to have any Regional Conferences at all, or what Regional Conferences we are to have, will depend, first of all, upon what powers are given to those Conferences. After we have come to some conclusion touching the powers given to the Regional Conferences, then we might take up the number of Regional Conferences; and after we have done that, we might be in a position to have some report as to the Judicial Council. It seems to me we are not ready at all until then. I understand that our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church find it necessary to withdraw and have a conference among themselves, and I hope as soon as possible we may come together and that first we may consider the powers of the Regional Conferences; and if the Chairman of the Commission does not deem that I am trespassing, I should be pleased to say one or two further words just at this point in order to enforce what I have been saying. There is considerable misunderstanding—I should not say misunderstanding—but there is a considerable difference of opinion among us. I take it that there is considerable difference of opinion among the members of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we say to them very frankly that there is considerable difference of opinion among the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, touching the powers to be given to Regional Conferences; and, as I remarked a moment ago, the number of Regional Conferences and whether we are to have any Regional Conferences at all will depend upon the powers given to the Regional Conferences. I am quite sure, speaking for myself alone, that it would be entirely possible to adopt the report which has been presented by the Committee to this Commission. I hope, therefore, before we undertake to discuss at all the Judicial Council or the status of the colored man in the reorganized Church, that we may take up together in joint conference the powers to be given to the Regional Conferences. I am very much interested in that, and the whole matter just now seems to be hinging upon a wise conclusion just at that point.

Rolla V. Watt: I am glad that Bishop Mouzon brought that forward. I expressed the opinion yesterday in our Committee that we have been wasting time in considering this matter in separate sessions. I am satisfied there is nothing in the problem that we cannot discuss together with better advantage. If we

go out and discuss a plan three or four days in separate conferences, when we come into the Joint Conference we shall have to do it all over again. Unless the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is ready to make a report similar to the one we are about to make on Judicial Council, it seems to me that we should proceed with the whole matter and see if we cannot get together. We want to be one, and why should we not commence to be one? I hope Bishop Mouzon's suggestion will be adopted.

Bishop Candler: I think that I can say, and my general impression is, that we have not considered the report on Judicial Council at all. I do not quite agree with Mr. Watt or with my colleague. If we have joint discussions, we have a representative relation; but I think we should separately discuss the various lines and then bring our material together for comparison.

Bishop Cranston: I am persuaded that the more we know about each other's thinkings the better progress we shall make. There is something in this meeting, in the spirit of the Commission that is calculated to lead to the impression, and it is a mutual impression, that there is some degree of uncertainty as to our errand or as to our authorization or as to possibly the loyalty of one Commission or the other or of one member of the Commission or another member of a Commission concerning the whole proposition. Then, again, outside of that, as Brother Watt has said, we must go over the whole subject a second time, revise and reconstruct, and then come to the conference to adjust, if possible, what ought to have been developed and adjusted in our mutual conferences together. I think we are wasting time, not all the time we use that way, but we are wasting some of our time in these separate discussions. If we could only come, every man of us, to believe in every other man of us and each Commission in the other Commission and to know that we all love Methodism with an equal devotion and to seek to readjust our opinions to conditions that we cannot change, we would get along. I am heartily in favor of doing our thinking and talking together just as far as practicable and being apart just as little as possible. And, brethren, I want to remind you while I am on my feet: It is not by the might or power of machinery that Methodism is to go forward; it is not by any wisdom that we, as Commissions or as individuals, may be able to manifest in the construction of the new ecclesiastical machine. Is it not that our mission is to preach the gospel, and our only business in reorganizing the Church is to get rid of everything that hinders the reorganization and make use of and improve everything that promises to help in the propagation of the cause of Jesus Christ? In a matter like this we must look to help from God in constructing our new ecclesiasticism. If we are to do the work of God, we must fol-

low the directions of God. It seems to me that in doing this work we shall get along better if we put aside in our means and methods of approach every device or resort that can use up any part of the time in wondering what the other side is doing or thinking and going straight at the one proposition which the Churches have sent us to achieve, the unification of the Church for the more rapid advancement of the Church of Jesus Christ. If we reduce the Articles of the Church to five or six or seven, the fewer the better. I could stand it if you got rid of half of your Conferences. I am saying this so that we may get our minds away from the over-emphasis of the machinery we shall construct, to get back to the fundamental divine commission by which we are a Church at all and then get back to the primary vital construction of the mission of the Church of Jesus Christ which we have transmitted to us. One of the greatest things about Wesley was that he could get away from a veneer of ecclesiasticism and bravely launch out on an evangelistic campaign for the conquest of the world. There are some things in our ecclesiastical methods that we should get away from as well as some things in our traditions that we should cling to. We have to adjust ourselves to this day and the demands of God for now and for to-morrow. I hope we shall get right down to that right now and stay with it without a doubt in the minds of any man as to the possible outcome of it. Who doubts is damned. Any man in this Commission who doubts condemns himself as a fit instrument for representing the Church in this matter. Let no man doubt the outcome; and let no man for one moment fancy that he may, without censure of men and without affronting the judgment of God, put himself or his own judgment in the way of a realization of the expectations we have in these two Churches. We have responsibility. We have stood before the Churches and declared ourselves on these propositions. From the day of the Chattanooga Agreement down to this hour these two Churches are committed to the project of unification, and from the day of the sanction in Oklahoma of the principles set forth at Chattanooga and the day of the sanction of those joint principles by the General Conference at Saratoga these two Churches are committed to union ultimately upon the basis of the Chattanooga proposition, and we cannot get away from that. I would not like to be the Commissioner who, having accepted a trust like this, would undertake to escape the responsibility I had assumed in taking the trust with the direct and positive unequivocal declaration on the part of both Conferences that unification is to be practically on the basis of the Chattanooga Agreement; and if I have any influence or any voice in this body, if God lets me live, I purpose to hold, as far as I can do it, so sacred the obligations that

254 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

I have accepted as to put the blame elsewhere if we shall come to an adjournment without having agreed to put forth for the future some form of reorganization embodying the basic principles of the Chattanooga suggestion.

Bishop Denny : I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : What is the point of order?

Bishop Denny : I do not apparently understand the motion that is before us and that is being discussed, and I call for a statement of the business at hand. I am entirely at sea.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The motion was that we hear the conclusion reached by the Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the subject of the Judicial Council. That is the motion that is before the house.

Bishop Cranston : I know I have transgressed parliamentary law, but the time has come for somebody to transgress parliamentary law and get us to doing something.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I do not think Bishop Cranston did transgress. I think what he said was eminently proper, but we would save time by sticking closely to the motion.

David G. Downey : I offer a suggestion that the Committee on Order and Procedure suggested that, after the report of the committees had been received, they should be discussed in the order in which they were read. We adopted that recommendation. That naturally would bring now before us the report of the Committee on Conferences. I move that we now take up and discuss the report of the Committee on Conferences.

A. J. Lamar : I want to find out, in the language of an Alabama Congressman a few years ago, "where we are at." We have received a brotherly and a respectful suggestion from our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church that they retire for consultation in order to see what they shall do with the answer of the Southern division.

Henry Wade Rogers : That was withdrawn.

A. J. Lamar : I beg pardon, then, and I second Dr. Downey's motion.

Bishop Denny : Will you allow me to insert a motion of the Committee on Procedure in order to meet the suggestion of the brethren living in Traverse City?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : There is a motion before us. That is the motion of Dr. Downey that we proceed with the discussion of the report of the Committee on Conference.

Bishop Denny : My apology is that the local brethren have asked us to give them an answer before noon.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : We will yield, then, on a question of privilege.

Bishop Denny : We were requested to appoint members to

fill the pulpits of the churches here for Sunday. The Committee appoints Bishop Candler in the morning and Bishop Hamilton in the evening for this Church. For Asbury we appoint Bishop Cranston in the morning and Bishop Mouzon at night. The Secretary will be good enough to make the announcements.

Bishop Cranston: I hope you will not press that duty on me. I am standing up first rate now, but it will save my strength not to have to preach on Sunday. Three sessions a day are a little more wearing on me than on you younger members. I don't think I should be asked to do anything beyond the duties of the chairmanship of this Commission, and I am sure that our people at Asbury would be delighted to hear Bishop Denny or Bishop Murray.

Bishop Denny: We thought it possible that Bishop Cranston might find it an inconvenient arrangement, and we decided that if Bishop Cranston thought it best not to take this additional strain Bishop Leete would take his place. So Bishop Leete will preach in the morning at Asbury and Bishop Mouzon at night.

Henry Wade Rogers: In reference to the motion I made, the purpose of the motion was simply to present here without discussion the report of the Committee on Judicial Council. This is the only report that our Commission has agreed upon. We have agreed upon that and have not agreed upon the report as to the Regional Conferences. I think it may be well, therefore, simply now to present to you the report on the Judicial Council without discussion simply for the purpose of informing you what we have agreed to, so that you may know and talk it over among yourselves as you please. Now, the motion has been made to discuss the report of the Committee on Conferences, and that may be then taken up if it is thought best. That is on the suggestion thrown out that we are wasting time by holding separate sessions of the Commissions.

Bishop Cranston: I hope we shall have a reading of this report, not that it shall be immediately discussed, but because every revelation of opinion from either Commission concerning either one of the problems that we have in hand throws light upon the other problems in some degree. It was thought, for instance, that the supreme court business would be rather a serious matter. Now, you brethren having this report and having knowledge of what it contains before you, it may have an effect on your ideas as to Regional Conferences, because the supreme court has something to do with the construction of any constitution.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion before us is Judge Rogers's motion to hear the report, and Mr. Downey moved as a substitute—

David G. Downey: I supposed when Judge Rogers presented

256 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

the motion originally it was that the report of the Committee on Judicial Council should be discussed. If the Judge's desire is only to present and read it, I will hold my motion until that is done.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I do not know whether I am ready to vote on this matter or not. I think up to this point there is a great deal of discussion, but I have a kind of feeling that it is not a wise way to approach this matter by presenting conclusions from one side or the other and that the discussions ought to be for the purpose of clarifying our own ideas and enabling us to get rid of some of our individualism and act together when we come together. I have a little suspicion that there might possibly be a tendency to cling to particular form of presentation because we have acted upon it as it has come before this body as a conclusion. I would not have voted for anything as the conclusion of our body. I don't think that was our idea. I think we had as many opinions as there were men. We could have presented to you fifteen plans for the supreme court, but I think we will increase the separation and unconsciously increase the tenacity of our own opinions by presenting conclusions of either side until the whole is ready. I am in favor simply of putting this matter entirely aside and proceeding in line with Dr. Downey's motion which he originally made, that we go ahead and discuss the subject we have been on to-day and upon which we have not reached a conclusion, but which we have discussed and upon which we have some idea formed.

Bishop Denny: I think it would be better for each Commission to reach its conclusions on these reports before presenting them. There comes a certain force and certain repression when we understand you have considered the report that we have not considered and leaves us not so free to make up our own conclusions. And then, besides, if we should find in our Commission, after having had the conclusion of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this report before us, that we could not agree, it would accentuate the differences by the fact that we come in here after having had your conclusions before the joint discussion takes place. If we were ready to exchange conclusions on the Judicial Council, or whatever may be its designation, it would be a different thing. But we have not considered a line of it; and if we have from the Northern brethren their conclusions before we consider the report at all, it will hamper us to no small extent and increase the difficulty. So that I suggest that we be allowed to consider that report later. It makes no difference which report we take up first, but I think before we should take up any report we should exchange conclusions.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 257

George W. Brown: I would like to ask for a vote on the motion we have before us.

J. F. Goucher: Our Commission reviewed the report of the Joint Committee and made some comments. The meeting was really a school of English; and there were about as many teachers as there were pupils, possibly more instructors than there were learners. That which was done was simply done tentatively, as suggestive of how we thought the court should be created, and it was not intended to bind any one. We did not reach any hard and fast conclusions. There is a good deal in what Bishop Denny has said. Therefore I think it would be better that we should not present our suggestions until you have your report considered—as ours was at our exercise in English, corrected, properly punctuated, and paragraphed—and then let both come in together. I cannot be expected to have anything more than an opinion, for I have not facts on which to base a conclusion; and I shall not have facts enough upon which to base a conclusion on any point in either report until I have heard a discussion of the proposed Judicial Council by those who have knowledge and information in both branches of the Joint Commission. I agree with Bishop Denny that the reports should be held until both come before us together.

E. B. Chappell: I feel somewhat embarrassed, as my brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church evidently desire to discuss this. I would like to suggest that they should withdraw—I don't want to invite them to withdraw—and agree among themselves; but if they want to withdraw, our Commission does not want to keep them here.

C. M. Bishop: There is no motion to withdraw before the house. That motion was withdrawn.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question before the house is the motion of Dr. Downey to proceed with the discussion of the report of the Committee on Conferences. That motion has been seconded, and we will take a vote on it.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Bishop Mouzon: First of all, I move that we take up the powers of the Regional Conferences for the reasons which I named a moment ago. Whether we are to have four or six or ten or thirty will depend upon the power given them, and whether we are to have any at all will depend on the power that is given them. We must know what kind of a thing it is that we are creating or that we are considering before we determine whether we will make it, and therefore I move that we take up the question of the powers to be given Regional Conferences.

The motion was seconded, put, and carried.

Bishop Denny: In order to expedite our work I ask consent to intrude at this point a motion that it be understood that these:

reports, after they shall have been passed upon by the Joint Commission, shall be committed to a subcommittee whose duty it shall be to see that all expressions of language are just as they should be; otherwise, as Dr. Goucher says, we shall be kept here over matters of minor import, whereas if we go ahead and deal with the substance we can leave to that special Committee and men familiar with that kind of work the matter of expression. I make that motion.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Secretary will now read the portion of the report dealing with the powers of the Regional Conferences.

The report referred to was read, as follows :

SECTION 3. Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction, and in the exercise of said power it shall have authority as follows :

(1) To elect the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference and to direct and control their activities within its jurisdiction. Such bishops elect shall be consecrated at such time and place as the General Conference may direct.

(2) To direct and control its benevolent organizations, enterprises, and institutions.

(3) To direct and control its educational enterprises and institutions.

(4) To direct and control the local Church press within its jurisdiction and to elect the editors of the same.

(5) To fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions within its jurisdiction and to provide for the organization of the same.

(6) To promote the spiritual and temporal interests of the Church within its jurisdiction.

(7) To provide for the administration of the Discipline within its jurisdiction.

(8) To make rules and regulations for such other local affairs as are not herein mentioned.

Provided, that no Regional Conference shall make any rule or regulation contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

Bishop Cranston here resumed the chair.

Bishop Mouzon : I move that we take up that section item by item.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Are there any remarks?

Bishop Denny : It occurred to me that a reconstruction right here without a change of the substance would be advisable. "To elect the number of bishops allotted to each by the General Conference." To stop there would leave to the General Conference the responsibility of determining the number of bishops in each Regional Conference without saying that a basis should be laid

down by the General Conference applicable to all the Regional Conferences. So it might be possible for the General Conference under some condition to give one Regional Conference double the number of bishops that are given to another. I suggest after the words "General Conference" that we insert a statement, "on a principle applicable to each Regional Conference," so that bishops to be elected shall be elected on a principle that shall apply to all the Regional Conferences.

Henry Wade Rogers: You mean a "uniform principle."

Bishop Denny: Yes.

Henry Wade Rogers: Should it be "each"?

Bishop Denny: No, I do not think that "each" should be inserted.

Bishop Cranston: You are on Subsection (11). Will you state that amendment again?

Bishop Denny: "On a principle applicable to each Regional Conference." Judge Rogers suggests the word "uniform."

Henry Wade Rogers: Uniform principle applicable to the Regional Conferences.

Bishop Denny: What is your thought as to the advantage of that rather than "each"?

Henry Wade Rogers: The principle should be uniform, applicable to all.

Bishop Denny: If applicable to each, it would be applicable to all. Sometimes the word "all" is used simply as a mass; but "each" is always used distributively, and I suggest that it remain "on a uniform principle applicable to each Regional Conference."

David G. Downey: I want to call attention to the underlying principle of this Section 3, Subsection (1). The general declaration is that each Regional Conference should have full power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction, and then Subsection (1) proceeds to say that that shall include the election of the Bishops and the direction and control of their activities within the jurisdiction. That practically makes the bishopric a distinctively local affair, and it is to that principle that I take serious objection. We all know that at the present time the episcopacy is not a distinctly local affair in either of our Churches. I do not believe it ought to be a distinctly local affair in either of our Churches. I believe that the power of nomination ought to inhere in the Regional Conferences, but that the power of election should be committed to the General Conference. I am not prepared at this time to make any motion. I am not ready for that, but this involves a complete departure from Methodist principles and from the method and usages heretofore obtaining. Our episcopacy is an itinerant general superintendency. It is protected by set rules; and although we have somewhat emasculated those rules in our communion, it still remains. Not only that; but if

this report is intended to keep the third restrictive rule, how can we harmonize that third restrictive rule with the provisions of this subsection. I cannot see it, and I do not know but what, having now fixed my thought by having talked about it, that I will make another amendment, that this subsection shall be changed to provide for the nomination of bishops by the Regional Conferences and their election to be committed to the General Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: This is a very important item. It deserves and must have very careful consideration. Some of my brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church maintain that it was just here, in the thinking of many of the men of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that this plan of the Unification of American Methodism by reorganization had its beginning and from this its point of departure. It was felt that the minority in certain sections needed to be protected, and the Regional Conference was devised in order that each region might elect its own bishop. Now, I think you will find that many of us will be satisfied if something of this sort is done and many of the powers which are here given to the Regional Conference be taken away and given back to the General Conference. The most important thing, as some of us see it, is that the regions should chose their own bishops.

Henry Wade Rogers: Don't they do that now by nominating?

Bishop Mouzon: Let us go on and see. How many would you nominate?

Henry Wade Rogers: I would nominate three and have one to be elected.

Bishop Mouzon: I would hate to be one of the three. There would be some "glorious" politics.

Bishop Denny: Some of them would never consent to be nominated under such conditions.

Bishop Mouzon: Here is one who would not. No; the very men we would want to serve would not consent to a nomination of that sort. I do not think that would work; I am sure it would not be satisfactory. But then you ask, What do I propose? I use the word "I." I am speaking for myself; and you will permit me to say I know I do not stand alone when I speak for myself, that I also speak for a number of others who do not want diocesan episcopacy. I believe in the general itinerant superintendency. It is old Methodism, and it has contributed more to connectionalism than anything else in the Church. I think that would be a solution of the difficulty. Let the regions elect and let the General Conference ordain, and I do not fight shy of that word "ordain." I am not high church enough to fight shy of it. John Wesley used it. And I am not a high-churchman. Some

brothers are high churchmen and believe in two orders and one office. Let the General Conference provide for the ordination and then let the General Conference distribute the bishops throughout the whole connection as the General Conference may see fit to distribute the bishops throughout the whole connection. Do you get my point? I am in entire sympathy myself, and now I speak for myself. Personally I am in entire sympathy with the idea of episcopal areas; not as presented to us the other day—I do not mean that—but something like the plan now being worked by our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of letting the General Conference distribute the bishops throughout the connection.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I am entirely in sympathy with your plan, but I would like to know if it would not likely create controversy if there should be an assignment of an ultra-Northern bishop to the far South.

Bishop Mouzon: To begin with, I do not think it would be done for several years.

Henry Wade Rogers: Neither do I.

Bishop Mouzon: I would be entirely willing to risk the General Conference, so far as I am concerned myself, and so far as I am myself concerned if you were to locate me in New England, while I would not enjoy the codfish and while I could hardly stand the climate, I would enjoy the people and be entirely at home in New England.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: If you come to Pennsylvania, we will give you shade.

Bishop Mouzon: Personally I am entirely willing to trust the General Conference; and until we love one another enough to trust one another, we do not love one another enough to get together at all. Now, let the General Conference distribute the bishops throughout the connection. For the first one or two Conferences it would not be done. Then pretty soon we would begin to do it, and we would begin to do it just as soon as possible, and that would contribute toward unity. By and by there would be a bishop of the extreme South going to the far North, and the brethren up North would then find that there can something good come out of Nazareth; and there would be some Northern bishop go down South, and the people of the South would say: "I declare we are the same sort of people, and we didn't know it." That would be splendid. Let the General Conference distribute the bishops throughout the connection, and then let the bishops at their annual meetings assign the bishops to the Conferences they are to preside over. That would be a great plan, and for that I stand now and propose to stand. Nobody has brought in any argument that has influenced me at all toward any other position. Now, that would protect the point.

that in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is a matter of importance. It is a matter of importance; and I do not think you can get our people to any other position than that the region elect its own bishop, such bishop to be ordained by the General Conference, and then to be distributed throughout the connection and then to be assigned to the Annual Conferences by the bishops at their annual meetings. That would be acceptable to a large number of our people. I believe we can find a meeting point there. That is not diocesan episcopacy, but general itinerant superintendency of the Methodist Church which we inherited from our fathers.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I know you want to save time, and I want you to stick to the motion before you. I was out, but Bishop Cranston told me the amendment was that the words should be inserted, "uniform principle applicable to each Regional Conference."

Bishop Mouzon: I insist that I was speaking directly to the point before us, and I believe the entire Commission will agree that I was speaking to the point before us.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Not if I understood the amendment.

Bishop Mouzon: The amendment affects the whole item, and I certainly was speaking to some part of this item.

P. D. Maddin: It looks to me like when we discuss the powers of Regional Conferences we necessarily must to some extent refer to General Conferences also, for you cannot determine what powers will go to the one without saying what powers shall be exercised by the others. I quite agree with the sentiment expressed by Bishop Mouzon that our people wish to have some voice in determining what bishops will go from the various jurisdictions, respectively; but I do not altogether agree that the Regional Conferences in their own sessions shall elect these bishops, and I will tell you why. I think a bishop of the united Church ought to be a bishop of the whole Church and not a bishop of one Jurisdictional Conference of that Church. If we have six Regional Conferences and each one elects its quota of bishops, we shall have so many bishops from these Conferences; and when they get outside of their own jurisdictions that elect them, they will not have the force and power they would have if they had been elected by the General Conference. We do not have in the Southern Church anything except the bishops of the whole Southern Church, and you have bishops of the whole Northern Church, and I think the idea suggested by this section by Bishop Mouzon can be accomplished in a better way. My idea is that the bishops should not be elected by Regional Conferences, but by the General Conference and under these conditions: that it shall be one of the powers of the General Conference to

fix the basis for the determination of the number of bishops to be elected and apply this basis to each Regional Conference and determine how many bishops shall be nominated by the representatives in the General Conference from each Regional Conference, respectively. Suppose they determine there shall be four from each one of the Regional Conferences. Then let the representatives of the General Conference from each one of those Regional Conferences respectively name the four men for bishops, to be confirmed or elected by the General Conference. If any one is not elected by the General Conference, let the members of that regional section nominate another until they have elected their quota. When you do that each one of the bishops will be elected by the General Conference of the whole Church, and each one will have all the power and all the influence that that election can give him, and, no matter where he goes, whether to Maine or California, he will be a bishop elected by the General Conference of the whole Church and with all the powers that a bishop of the Church should have. To my mind, that will bring about unity of thought and feeling far better than for each sectional Conference to elect its own bishops to be consecrated by the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: Will you allow a question?

P. D. Maddin: Yes, sir.

Bishop McDowell: Do you think that will accomplish what Bishop Mouzon has in his mind, the retention of the principle of local self-government?

P. D. Maddin: I think it does it thoroughly. If the bishop has to be nominated by the General Conference coming from a local area, they necessarily determine who the man is to be. The area of Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia would nominate three men for bishops, and all three would be elected. That area has determined who those bishops would be. The general area determines who the bishops they shall nominate will be, and each area will have an exerting influence in determining who the bishop from its area will be. Another feature that follows as a corollary to that is this: There is a feeling in our section that bishops who are acquainted with us, who are acquainted with our people, and who are acquainted with our ministers can better administer the affairs of our Annual Conferences than one who comes from a distance and does not know the ministers or the people or our particular needs. Consequently there has arisen a feeling that we want to be presided over by our own bishops. We would rather have Bishop Denny come down and fix us up than to have some one who does not know the preachers or the presiding elders and does not know us. My idea for providing for that is this: Each Regional Conference may, by a majority

vote, at each quadrennial session, have the right to require that the session of the Annual Conferences within its jurisdiction shall be presided over by bishops nominated by its representatives in the General Conference—in other words, by its bishops—but in the absence of such a vote each Annual Conference shall be held by any bishop designated by the College of Bishops. What would be the result of that plan? The first years the result would be that our Conference would pass a vote that we should be presided over by a bishop nominated from our area, and so they would be assigned. But the area of California would say, "We don't care what bishop presides over us; send us a bishop from the far East or the far South"; and Pennsylvania would say, "Give us a bishop elected in Tennessee"; and New England would say, "Give us a bishop elected in Montana." What would be the result? Those areas that have manifested some fear of being presided over by some one not from that area would be ashamed to repeat the manifestation. They would feel small and provincial in requiring that they be presided over by men of their own area and not of any other; and that will wholly abolish, by the will of the people, any idea that one bishop cannot preside over one territory as well as over any other territory, no matter where the bishop comes from. If we can embody these two ideas of electing the bishops and where they preside, we shall go very far toward bringing about unification. One word more, and I hope that you will not let it mean more than it means to me. You will understand why we have to insist on something. I say it in all kindness, and to me it is a joke, but to some of my people it is serious. A few days before I left for the Baltimore conference a very loyal Methodist and a first-class business man met me, and he said: "You are going to Baltimore to unify the two branches?" I said: "I am going to try." He said: "That is all right, because the General Conference said so; but let me tell you what will happen: You will go up there, and you will bring about some system of unification, and about one year after you unify they will come down here and take Smith and Lamar and send them back to preaching in the backwoods, and they will put in managers for your Publishing House." [Laughter.]

Bishop Cooke: That man must have taken something more than sirup.

Bishop Denny: No; he knew what would be a good thing for the backwoods.

P. D. Maddin: And he added: "Dr. Chappell has been in charge of Sunday school literature for ten years, and they have fifty men up there better fitted for the job."

A. J. Lamar: I rise to a point of privilege. That man is in

ignorance of what is going on. I am a candidate for chief justice of the supreme court of the reorganized Church.

P. D. Maddin: "Dr. Anderson has been running the Board of Education, and they will send him off in a hurry. Dr. Pinson is running the Board of Missions, and some one else will be drawing his salary in just about three months." I tell you that as a joke, but there is a whole lot of people in our Church who feel that way. That makes it a little difficult for us to get along. We have to regard that feeling. We hope you will indulge us in what are apparently a number of things that to you look ridiculous and that may look like we have some suspicion, which we have not, that you are not Christians. We must insist on certain things in order to cater to a sentiment not entirely passed away. My belief is that if we can get together and start, in four years we can cut down half of these restrictions, and in eight years they can be entirely eliminated.

H. M. Du Bose: This resolution, with possibly some slight additions that will come when we reach other sections, is just about what we want. Section 7 of the Chattanooga Agreement, on page 39 of this book, reads: "We suggest that the Quadrennial Conferences shall name the bishops and their several jurisdictions, the same to be confirmed by the first house of the General Conference." Here the "first General Conference" is eliminated. The Committee preferred in this subsection to confirm and consecrate the bishop; but here we have eliminated the word consecrated, but we agreed in the Committee that the authority will be expressed elsewhere in the manner of consecration. They insist that the General Conference should do it, and it was agreed among us that these acts of consecration would be provided for, and when we come to the proper place we can state the confirmation as desired. Certainly it is absolutely necessary in the view of many of us to carry out the idea of the episcopacy and the connectional quality of the episcopacy to have it originated in the Quadrennial Conferences to meet the local needs and conditions; but it must be passed in some way to the General Conference, and that act is expressed in the provision of this subsection that the General Conference shall provide for the consecration.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I find myself not only in entire accord with what Bishop Denny and Bishop Mouzon have said, but I think it will be conducive to accurate action if we do not mix the two things. Brother Denny has called my attention to something which was an oversight. It ought to be met and controlled by appropriate words in the section under discussion, but it has no bearing on the question that Bishop Mouzon debated or on the question that Mr. Maddin debated. It seems to me that accurate thinking and accurate voting will call upon us to pass upon these

distinctive questions separately. I do not quite like the language of Bishop Denny or of Judge Rogers.

Bishop Denny: I think this will meet the situation: After the words "General Conference" insert the words "according to uniform principles."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The language I had was this: I had inserted after the word "bishop" the words "from time to time" and after the words "General Conference" the words "by general rule applicable to all of the Regional Conferences," so that Sub-section (1) will read: "To elect the number of bishops from time to time allotted to it by the General Conference by general rule applicable to all Regional Conferences," etc. That makes it as clear as it can very well be. It gets into it the thought that Bishop Denny had and another thought that there shall be from time to time, as the General Conference decides necessary, a change in the number of Bishops allotted to each of the Regional Conferences. Whether the language I have offered goes, or whether that of Bishop Denny or that of Bishop Mouzon, is immaterial, except that in the minds of one or the other of us the language is more clear. But I should like to see that these distinctive questions should be considered by themselves and not be mixed up with other questions. We have the matter clearly defined; and I therefore appeal to this body to let Bishop Denny's motion, whether in the form that he presents it or in the form that I present it, be disposed of first before we get into the larger and more important question.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I think Brother Simpson is entirely right.

Rolla V. Watt: I rather favor the language of Mr. Simpson for one reason. I don't think there is any difference between "a uniform principle applicable" and "by rules applicable to all Conferences." But here is an important matter that I have forgotten from Dr. Claudius B. Spencer. You will see that the district I am in (No. 5) embraces twice as many States as any other district and has a much smaller population. We have in my district 1,400,000 square miles, while District No. 5 has 178,000 square miles. If this "general rule applicable to all" takes into consideration not only the population, but also area, all right. But I would not want it fixed on the basis of Church membership from a geographical area as large as ours. What language will cover that is for you gentlemen to decide, but it should be made "general" both as to area and as to membership to be looked after.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion before the house is the motion of Bishop Denny with an amendment offered by Mr. Simpson.

Bishop Denny: I accept the insertion of the words "from time

to time" if they are placed after the word "elected," so that it would read "to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference," etc. I think we shall gain everything that way, and I don't know what "a general rule" would mean that the word "rule" would not mean. If it were a rule applicable to all Regional Conferences, it would be as general as would be necessary, and I don't think the word "general" is necessary.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I think you are right.

Bishop Denny: As to the suggestion of Brother Watt, we could cover it by the insertion of a few words suggested by Dr. Goucher. After the words "General Conference," where they first occur, insert "according to a uniform principle."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I do not think the difference is worth an amendment. I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

Edgar Blake: I want to raise this question: I do not know just how much is involved in that amendment, "a uniform principle," whether that would confine itself to a single element or to more than one; for when we come to fix the number of bishops that are to be allotted to a given area, there are at least two elements to be taken into consideration. One is the interests that are to be administered, the number of Churches, and the membership and everything in relation to that. Then there is a second element of area that is to be covered by the bishops in their administration. In other words, of course, it will be a vastly easier proposition for the bishop to administer in a territory of a million members, provided that area were very compact, than it would be to administer in an area of a million members if the area were three times the size of the other geographically. So it would appear to be that these two elements will have to be taken into consideration—fixing the number of bishops to be allotted to any particular area, and what I am inquiring about is whether the word "principle" would cover both.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: As a matter of law it would.

Bishop Denny: The principle might be stated in terms of space and number, and then it would be uniform.

Edgar Blake: I am in hearty sympathy with what Bishop Denny is after.

J. J. Wallace: I desire to call attention to this fact, that we are determining a power of the General Conference by Bishop Denny's motion, and we are now on a question of the Regional Conference. Let me call attention to the fact that Section 7 under the power of the General Conference reads:

To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy, to fix the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, and to require the same.

There is where Bishop Denny's amendment really belongs. It is not a power of the Regional Conference, but power of the General Conference.

Bishop Denny: I just answered that. I had thought of it. If both statements are needed, one under the powers of the Regional Conference and the other under the powers of the General Conference, the same statement could be made, and there would be no contradiction. But if we propose to pass here under the powers of Regional Conferences a clause of this kind, it must be guarded where it appears, and that is my point in bringing it up here.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Let the Chairman ask a question of the Committee of Procedure. You adopted a provision that everything should be adopted by a majority?

John F. Goucher: I suggest that all votes be taken tentatively. We do not want to commit ourselves until we know what the final vote is on other propositions. Therefore I move that the vote taken on these reports shall be considered as tentative.

Henry Wade Rogers: What Bishop Candler wants to know is whether it takes a majority vote or not.

Secretary Thomas: Do you want the rule read?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Yes.

Secretary Thomas: Rule 5 reads: "No action shall be regarded as valid unless by a majority vote of the Board of Commissioners."

John F. Goucher: That was in my mind. The vote will not be binding. It is only tentative at this time, and before anything is valid the final result must have the majority vote of both sides.

Claudius B. Spencer: I greatly approve of the motion of Dr. Goucher for the reason that there is a large number of the Joint Commission who do not participate in the debates, and it will be helpful when we come to see what the general consensus of opinion was.

Bishop Cooke: I do not catch the exact matter. Are we now about to vote upon the suggestion of Bishop Denny?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): An amendment.

Bishop Cooke: On the method of election.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair will follow the usual parliamentary procedure and will put the question first on the amendment and then on the section as amended.

Bishop Cooke: So that we are going to an election of bishops by Regional Conferences.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: After the section is amended.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): And a man can vote for something as amendment that he thinks improves the section that is offered and then vote against the section as amended.

Bishop Cooke: I was leading up to that matter.

E. C. Reeves: In the very nature of things this is not final and cannot be anything more than tentative.

A vote being taken, the motion of Dr. Goucher was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The vote now is on the amendment to insert the words "according to a uniform principle."

A vote being taken, the amendment was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): And now the question is on the approval of the section as amended.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: There are amendments to be made to that.

David G. Downey: And there is another amendment already offered.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair was not aware that there was any other amendment.

Bishop Cranston: I understood Dr. Downey to express an opinion that something ought to be and not that he offered an amendment.

David G. Downey: The amendment was to the effect that the Bishops be nominated by the Regional Conferences and be elected by the General Conference. Now, I am perfectly willing to give up that amendment if Brother Maddin will put his point as an amendment to this.

P. D. Maddin: My point would have to come under consideration when you come to the powers of the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: It was agreed a moment ago that it might come in both places.

P. D. Maddin: Then I move in lieu of this Section 1 as follows: "That it shall be the duty of the General Conference to fix the basis for determining the number of bishops to be elected, to apply this basis to each Regional Conference, and to determine how many bishops shall be nominated by the representatives in the General Conference from each Regional Conference respectively. The General Conference shall elect upon the nomination of the members from the Regional Conferences, respectively, the number of bishops to which each is entitled, such bishops to be consecrated at such time and place as the General Conference may direct."

David G. Downey: That ought to come in under the powers of the General Conference; but in order that it may come in and make it effective if we are going to adopt such a thing, the words should be "nominate from time to time," and there are a great many of us who feel in harmony with what Brother Maddin says, that every bishop who goes out ought to have back of him the election of the General Conference and the prestige of the influence that comes therefrom. If we are to maintain the continuity of itinerant general superintendency, if we are to

maintain the connectional influence and power of the bishop, the bishops being a unified body as in the past, we must in some way arrange to have these bishops elected by the General Conference. I realize full well the point made by Bishop Mouzon that the areas, especially those of the South, desire a certain amount of protection, the protection of the minority in which we are all equally interested; and I must believe that the suggestion coming from Brother Maddin, that the nominations be made by the representatives of the Regional Conferences in the General Conference, does give protection to the minority. Take a group of men from a certain region. The Regional Conferences have been settled in perfect harmony. Let them nominate the men they would like to have elected. The General Conference may elect them or decline to elect them. Others may be nominated by the same Regional Conferences, and a nominee of the Regional Conferences will be elected by the General Conference, and they will be bishops of the entire Church. Brother Maddin has spoken about the necessity of our yielding something to the prejudices in his part of the Church in order to get certain legislation. I think you will need to bear in mind that there are certain prejudices in our section of the Church. We have got these things. There are General Conferences; and I think it would be a matter of considerable difficulty to get through our Church the idea of the bishops elected primarily by areas and held to the area, which is practically diocesan episcopacy. Therefore I hope we shall adopt the amendment and have the nomination of the bishops by the Regional Conferences with the further idea as suggested by Brother Maddin, that these regional areas do the nominating at the General Conference, and that, I am sure, would obviate much of the difficulty suggested by Bishop Mouzon with respect to politics and everything of that kind.

Bishop Hamilton: I am not going to make a speech; but I want to state a fact, and you may apply it as you please. I am not ready to make my speech. I have made a study in our Church of the election of bishops from the first down until now and tabulated it at one time some years back, and I found this to be the case: That while we have opposed the nomination of any candidate for the episcopacy, the only exception you will find to it you will find in the *Daily Advocate* of 1852. When the four candidates were up, Bishop Simpson among the number, some brother arose and stated that it was currently reported that Dr. Simpson was not a candidate, and I am here to say that Dr. Simpson said: "There is not a word of truth in it." This is a fact, in spite of the fact that we did not nominate in every section of our Church, that there have been silent conspiracies that have nominated and that nomination has never in the history of the election amounted to more than two times the number

elected; and if you were to scatter the New England Conference before the General Conference into the woods and send some one around to tabulate them, you couldn't get from the entire membership when it was summed up more than twice the number that would be probable candidates from New England; and when you come to the General Conference, there never has been more than twice the number that have had any possible chance of election; and when the first ballot, which is usually a nomination, has been taken, you will find more frequently there never has been twice the number that are in the thought of the Conference as they go to work to elect. I do not know how it is with yours, but that has been the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church. There has been an occasional exception where a man has come in cold—a dark horse, as they say—but it is so exceptional that even when he came it was a nomination of himself; but never will you find in the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the number has exceeded twice the number to be elected.

Bishop Denny: I do not care to go into the question with thoroughness at this time. I do not commit myself to the number, but I call attention to this fact. We could not commit to the General Conference the power of confirming by a majority or of rejecting by a majority. You brethren must keep in mind a fact that may not have occurred to you, but while we were together as a Church the only Southern men elected bishops were William McKenzie and James O. Andrew. Those were the only Southern men put into the episcopacy from the beginning of the Church until the division. So that if you propose to adopt this plan that is now before you for consideration and expect it to prevail, you must put in some such clause as that it shall take at least two-thirds of the General Conference to decline to confirm the man presented to that General Conference by the Regional Conference. Otherwise, the minority is unprotected, and the majority has just simply complete control. Now, I do not care to go into the number, but I want to call attention to one fact which would be vital for some of us at least. I think that it ought to be understood; and if it be understood, it ought to be expressed, for a legal right unexpressed is no right at all. To say such and such is a rule of the Church, unless the statement is written into the fundamental document, is to run counter to all history. It must be written in the law. If this plan prevails, there ought to be a privilege given to any Regional Conference to take any man in Methodism for its bishop, not simply out of its own region. You brethren know that the South elected James in 1844. But for the Southern vote, he would not have been a bishop. It may be that there is some man who may not be so popular in the North or in the South that would be eminently

III Proceedings in the First Commission on Unification

should I exercise the judicial duties of the episcopacy that shall be referred from the two sessions. If I were a member of the General Conference and a Regional Conference in the part of the country in which I have wanted to take a seat from the first, why should we not have the privilege?

Bishop Candler: "Why wouldn't you have it?"

Bishop Denyer: I want a written or there

Bishop Lee Rogers: However, is eligible unless disqualifed.

Bishop Denyer: This would depend on the construction of the by-laws of each conference, while it is in the minds of the brethren that some such clause must be inserted to protect the minority who do not care to be majority in the General Conference.

Bishop Denyer: There is another matter here that I wish to be discussed, which is the name of an amendment to Mr. Maddin's position. In view of several differences were contemplated what I suggested was that it not be so all-embracing though, as Bishop Denyer has suggested, when's understood, if it is not in the bond, that the bishop "Such bishops elected shall be consecrated at such time and place as the General Conference may direct." It can't be the place as the General Conference may direct. It can't be the time. It does not seem to admit of any misunderstanding. But the Church is divided into regions, is it possible that a bishop may be consecrated in that region? Can you present a case where the two regions have concurred? We have elected these bishops, and we have consecrated them? What about it? I am strongly in favor of having a new "such bishops shall be consecrated at the General Conference at such time as the General Conference may determine." Of course it is understood that it should be considered at the General Conference, but it is not to be now.

The Chairman: Bishop Candler: I don't think we can consider that in connection with the amendment just offered by Bishop Denyer. I think we will economize time by withholding that, until the amendment is out of the way.

Bishop Candler: I thought the amendment of Mr. Maddin was

"The Chairman: Bishop Candler: Mr. Maddin's amendment was to leave the General Conference."

Mr. Wade Regis: What is the matter before the house?

The Chairman: Bishop Candler: To substitute "nominate" instead of "name".

C. M. Phelps: There is a vast difference between "name" and "nominate". When this whole movement of unification was started in the Committee of Nine at Cincinnati—I believe Bishop Candler and myself are the only ones here who were present that matter was debated for three days, and we realized there

would not be any headway unless there was a compromise somewhere; and so the final compromise on the section was agreed to that was adopted at Chattanooga: "We suggest that the Quadrennial Conferences shall name their own bishops and other officers and be vested with all powers not expressly granted to the General Conference." I realize we have a right to change it, but I am trying to get before you the thought of the start we had and the force of it. At Chattanooga Dr. R. P. Miller, than whom there never was a better or nobler man in American Methodism and who helped frame the first series of agreements, moved to amend and strike out the word "name" and insert "nominate," also to strike out the word "confirm" and insert the words "elected by." I then offered the following substitute: Insert "shall name and ordain that bishop," and they laid both Dr. Miller and myself on the table. The point I am making is this: Unless we change our whole constitution, we must cling to the naming of the bishops by the Regional Conferences. If we hold to the idea of Regional Conferences, we must leave to them the power to name, and that does not mean "nomination."

David G. Downey: What does that mean?

F. M. Thomas: It means to elect.

David G. Downey: Let us say it then.

F. M. Thomas: Whatever form is finally fixed for the selection of bishops, I can never conscientiously vote for the "nomination" as here suggested. I think it will produce an indescribable condition.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I am in thorough agreement with all the statements that have been made to the effect that it would be a desirable thing, almost a necessary thing, to preserve our connectionalism that the bishops shall be elected by the General Conference. The substitution of the ordination or consecration for election practically amounts to nothing. The General Conference does not ordain anybody. A bishop is ordained in the presence of a General Conference, and that is all there is to it. He is ordained by the bishops and elders coöperating. It is not required to be done even in the presence of the General Conference, and it leaves us with practically nothing to do unless the General Conference would proceed with the ordination, which would be unsatisfactory and an unpleasant way to get out. I do not quite like the idea of "name" because that is equivalent to an election and means the same thing. If there is to be connectional authority behind the bishop, he must get that authority from the General Conference. I do not know whether the proposition of Bishop Denny is necessary to secure the action of the Regional Conference from being overruled. It at least leaves the general power that the General Conference cannot substitute anybody of its own liking for the nominations made. They must

go back to the same Regional Conference for a nomination if they refuse to accept the first one. It could be arranged in such a way that the agreement of three Regional Conferences in the General Conference, voting by regions, as has been provided, would be sufficient to confirm an election. But, with my experience with elective bodies in the Methodist Episcopal Church and of the confirmation of nominations, it is almost inconceivable--it is inconceivable unless some extremely great personal objection should arise, that a nomination should not be confirmed. Of course if there should be a suspicion of a man's personal character, and that suspicion should arise after the nomination, there would be a rejection. Over and over again there are persons to be elected to this and that institution and so on by nominations, and I am just wondering if anybody has any record of anybody ever having been rejected. A nomination is practically equivalent to an election; and only a person who was extremely objectionable to a larger part of the connection would find the majority against him, and it is a question in my mind whether it would be a profitable thing either to the regions or to the connection as a whole that a man who has made himself offensive to the whole Church should be elected bishop of the whole Church. It would be better for them to elect somebody else who would please them. I am thoroughly in favor of the amendment.

Bishop Denny: I offer this: "The election to be effective unless it shall be overruled by a majority of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Do you offer that as a substitute?

Bishop Denny: I move to amend the amendment by inserting that clause.

A. J. Lamar: I do not wish to consume your time, and I would not speak at all if I were not of the firm conviction that the attention of all our brethren ought to be called to this fact. We are here now dealing with what is an entering wedge. The real question that comes up here is as to whether the people of the regions through their regional authority shall select their bishops or whether it shall be done for them by the General Conference. The question is whether we shall preserve for the local region the power to control its own affairs or whether we shall give all that power to the General Conference and have practically an unlimited General Conference. That is the real question that lies underneath all these motions. Now, if you please, the power to confirm carries with it the power not to confirm. The power to approve carries with it the power to reject. You can all see that in a moment. We all realize it. What power would the Regional Conference have to name the bishop who should preside over it if we were to adopt this prop-

osition to give to the General Conference the real decision of who shall be the bishop. It has been said here if the General Conference rejects the nomination made by the Regional Conference, let the Regional Conference nominate another man. But, if you please, the Regional Conference is not in session. The Regional Conference was in session probably two years previous to the General Conference and has nominated a man, and now this General Conference rejects him, and we must wait two years without a bishop elected by our own people. Now, I want to say to you brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as well as to the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that we ought, while we are together here, to remember that we are not here as individuals to utter our own personal sentiments concerning the great questions which come before us. What we do here has to be passed upon by the General Conference of the two Churches if we do anything definite toward unification, and I trust we can, and whatever we do has to be passed upon by the Annual Conference of both Churches, and we have to have a record of the sentiment of our people. It has been a matter of profound astonishment to me that you gentlemen, able as you are, astute as you are, have not been able to grasp one point. You want union. You cannot get union, real union, at one step. But if you start this thing growing, if you would accept everything that Southern sentiment or, if you please, Southern prejudice demands and get it started, it wouldn't be a great while before we should find in the South as well as in the North that modifications were not only desirable, but were absolutely necessary to the efficient working of our machinery. I realize the cumbersomeness of this system of government by Regional and General Conferences which we are proposing in this report of the Committee. I realize that that system will not work with anything like perfect efficiency. I think every regional man sees that; but, if you please, we have some men gifted with common sense in the South; we have some men of common sense in the North; and if you get them together, they would begin at the very first session of their Regional Conferences to have doubts as to whether this thing will work or not, and amendments will be proposed, and it would not be a great while before amendment after amendment, modification after modification would be made, and we would get a great, powerful, efficient Church. That would be the inevitable result. The trouble at the bottom of it is, you and I meet together in convention; we mix with each other in Sunday school councils, in publishers' associations and in editors' associations; but back behind us of the South and back behind you of the North are the great bodies of our common people making up the great body of the Church, but we don't understand each other in separate sessions. If we can get them

to meet, if we can get them to mixing, it would not be long before the people of the North would realize that in meeting with the men of the South you are meeting men with high ideals, that these are not men who delight in murder or in outrages against morality. These are pretty good men. Then our people would realize that you are not very far from us and you are not scheming to try to override us at every turn and are in great danger of accomplishing it, but that you are pretty good gentlemen in effect. We would both come to conclusions like that in a few years—that we are all just folks, some of us good, some of us bad, and some of us indifferent, but the same folks, North and South, narrow men and broad men on both sides, unselfish men and selfish schemers on both sides, men governed by personal ambition and hope of personal aggrandizement through the party organization and men governed by love of God on both sides. I am a Southerner—I want that understood. I do believe that the great duty before us and the exalted privilege which is within our reach and grasp, the most exalted and the greatest that has come to us in all our lives, is the duty and privilege now before us of unifying American Methodism. Don't let us try to do it all at once, but when we can take one step let us take it. You think the Regional Conference shouldn't have any power; we are sure it should have. Now, we cannot yield everything on one side or the other, but let us get a working basis. No matter how distasteful it is, let us be getting something that we can put through and get our people together, that they may learn to know each other, and then they will have each other, and then we shall have the real union.

Bishop Leete: I understand the importance of what Dr. Lamar has said. I even go further than he does in this respect, but I think perhaps we unconsciously underestimate our people and ourselves. I do not doubt that there is more willingness on the part of the people to get some kind of workable initiation of this movement than we realize. That is to say, I think, despite the fact that we do have a fairly considerable number of narrow-minded people, in general the Church wants unification. I should say both Churches, but I do not think in those terms. And if this Commission can get together somewhere on a basis that we can practically unanimously maintain, I do not think there are enough little people in our Churches to prevent their going into that thing with a considerable measure of hopefulness. I do not minimize at all the statement of Dr. Lamar that small people exist. But I rose at this time to state that I find myself in very substantial agreement with the position of Bishop Denny. I think it is necessary to be careful; and I will go farther than he and would make the number he suggests not two-thirds, but three-fourths.

Bishop Denny: I accept that.

Bishop Leete: I suspected you would.

Bishop Denny: Your suspicions are good.

Bishop Leete: As I look at it, the rejection of an election to the episcopacy made by a Regional Conference would be a very serious thing to Methodism, so serious that it should be restricted by every possible safeguard. You might just as well go out of business as a Church as to attempt to dominate any portion of that Church by the will of a mere majority. Personally I would stand for making the required number as high as nine-tenths. I do not believe that any selfish propaganda or scheme on the part of some small element or any personal ambition of any individual ought to be permitted for one moment to endanger the election of a man chosen by any part of a Methodist constituency. I think there would be great wrong in the possible withholding of a confirmation—not for defeat, but to create a balance of power somewhere else for the time being. I grant you I am dealing with possibilities rather than probabilities. I thoroughly believe there will be very little disposition to defeat a nomination. Indeed, I think it is a very remote possibility that there would be any attempt to defeat or delay a nomination for the purpose of affecting the balance of power, but we should guard against the occurrence of such an occasion as that arising anywhere in Methodism. Whenever a region (and I am not going to discuss whether regions shall have this right) shall nominate for the episcopacy, I think we should guard against its being in the power of a small number of people to defeat the will of that local constituency. I say that in support of what Bishop Denny has properly raised. I would not leave it to the will of any sort of a majority which may be determined by little groups of people to control the balance of power for a moment. We shall be a heterogeneous body when we are together, composed of various elements, one body, with a diversity of elements composing us, having, as we hope, all kinds of people in our membership. It might be that a small number could do something that would be hurtful, and may God help us to safeguard and protect even the smallest minority from the recurrence of events which we here deplore.

Bishop Mouzon: I should like to ask for the reading of Bishop Denny's amendment.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The question behind Brother Downey's motion is whether the Regional Conference shall nominate or elect. If we desire, they should elect. Bishop Denny's motion is not necessary, and I think Bishop Denny's motion should stand aside until the broad question is decided. Then if this Commission decides that the Regional Conferences shall elect we can take up Bishop Denny's motion.

Bishop Denny: I have no objection to that. All I had in mind was to save the parliamentary situation.

Bishop Mouzon: Hasn't any one the right to call for the reading of a paper before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Yes, if he has the floor. Brother Simpson was on the floor when you arose.

Bishop Mouzon: Well, I am on the floor now.

The amendment, the reading of which was requested by Bishop Mouzon, was read, as follows: "This election to be effective unless overruled by two-thirds of the General Conference present and voting."

Bishop Mouzon: I should like to amend Bishop Denny's amendment so that it would read this way: "Such election shall be confirmed unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the General Conference."

Bishop Denny: Say three-fourths.

Bishop Mouzon: This is put positively, not negatively. "Such election shall be confirmed unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the General Conference."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Don't you think we had better decide the general question before we enter into things like this? If we should decide that the General Conference elects, this would be of no effect.

Bishop Mouzon: Bishop Denny has an amendment before the House, and I am trying to get that amendment in shape to satisfy me, and I offer an amendment to it which would make it read: "Such election shall be confirmed by the General Conference unless rejected by a two-thirds majority."

Bishop Denny: Let me examine that amendment of yours. I may be able to accept it.

John M. Moore: I think it is very well that we should have as much light as possible on the entire question of the election of bishops and also the general work of the Regional Conferences before we adopt any vote. I would be in much better position to vote on these various suggestions and amendments if I knew I had full light. Dr. Lamar in his address spoke of the possibility of a man's being nominated or named at a Regional Conference and then having to wait two years before he is elected.

A. J. Lamar: You missed my point. If he were rejected by the General Conference, the Regional Conference would have to wait until the next session to nominate another.

John M. Moore: That takes it for granted that the Regional Conference meets every two years. We have not decided that the Regional Conference should meet every two years. There are many of us who believe that the Regional Conferences should not meet oftener than every four years.

A. J. Lamar: So much the worse then.

John M. Moore: It is possible that the Regional Conferences might be combined in the General Conference, and I desire very much to ask if Dr. Hyer, who has some suggestions to make along this line, could be called to the floor to give some suggestions which I am sure will help us. He might throw some light on the subject that would be of value to us in determining many of these questions. I would like very much to yield the floor to Dr. Hyer.

Bishop Mouzon: I shall be happy to have Dr. Hyer give some suggestions, but a motion to amend Bishop Denny's amendment is before the house.

R. S. Hyer: I appreciate very much the honor Dr. Moore has conferred on me by requesting me to repeat some remarks I made to him last night, and I shall take advantage of this opportunity to refer to what Dr. Thomas has said. I also have been a member of the Commission, first of all, on Federation for several years, and in all our deliberations it has been definitely understood that the regional idea obtains. Our people of the Southwest do demand a certain amount of autonomy. The thing we desire is this, however, if I understand my people correctly, that we should have a distinct voice in the election of bishops. In other words, we desire that we shall have a right to name a certain number of the bishops who are to be the officers of our reunited Methodism. To this end we have conceived the idea of Regional Conferences. I don't think we have at any time surrendered the idea of regional autonomy; but when we come to define what we mean by Regional Conferences I think you will discover sooner or later that in desiring these Conferences we have but one principal purpose in view—namely, that we shall have the right to elect the bishop. Now, the technicality in regard to the election and nomination is not important. I think we shall all agree that the position in which we have that matter just now is acceptable—namely, that if the Regional Conference decides on a certain man as its choice, that man shall become bishop unless three-fourths of the Church shall decline to allow him to do so. That is a condition that could scarcely arise. It seems to me the embarrassment in giving the General Conference the right under any condition to refuse confirmation arises from this fact, that the election of this bishop may take place several years prior to the assembling of the General Conference, and I think we all do desire that when a bishop of the Methodist Church is consecrated it shall be at the General Conference and in the presence of the entire episcopal college, that every one may understand that this bishop is not a sectional bishop, but a bishop of the entire Church. Therefore it has occurred to me that possibly this embarrassment of his having been elected and yet not confirmed in the way in which we all desire, a confirmation of

such character that every one may see that he is a bishop of the entire Church, that that embarrassment can be removed if we would somewhat change certain sections of the report, those sections dealing with how the Regional Conference shall be constituted and when and where it shall meet. The suggestion I have made to several is along this line: that we retain, as in this report, these distinct and separate areas, not, however, for legislative purposes, but for administrative and electoral purposes. If that be the case, I simply say, Why is it necessary for these Conferences to meet oftener than once every four years? and why could it not meet at the same place as the General Conference? Why should not those delegates from those areas who have been elected to the General Conference exercise all the rights and privileges we have had in mind when we order the Regional Conference at all. Some will say the objection to it is this: The provision here made for the Regional Conference is that it shall be constituted of at least 200 and not more than 450. The plan which I propose necessarily would reduce that number somewhat. In other words, if the members of the Regional Conferences are to be composed only of those delegates to the General Conference, it would necessarily be a smaller body; but if our General Conference should consist of 600 men, each of those regions would have approximately 100 delegates present. It occurred to me that possibly these men representing the various Annual Conferences of these regions would in all probability include all men who would be what might be called "bishop timber," and it would certainly be a representative number of the Church. For my part, I would be quite proud for the bishop from my area to be selected by 100 men at the General Conference. Now, you see, if our bishops are elected in that way, there could no embarrassment arise as to the matter of time between the selection and acceptance by the Conference and their consecration. Therefore it has occurred to me that if this report could be modified in such a way that the Regional Conference is to be composed of those members of the Annual Conference who have been elected as delegates to the General Conference and that those Regional Conferences meet only at the General Conference and for the performance of only these electoral purposes, possibly the thing that we people from the South desire has been accomplished, and at the same time when bishops are created they will be recognized by all as bishops of the entire Church. I think that those areas would, as a rule, expect those bishops to be returned to them—that is, the bishops selected by those areas would under ordinary conditions act as episcopal units for the administration of such areas. Provision would be desirable whereby bishops from one area could be transferred to another.

Bishop McDowell: I think I have not at any time felt quite so hopeful of the possibility of arriving at a fairly good conclusion on this subject as I do this minute. I think we have to-day obtained a larger light upon a way through what has been a real perplexity to many men than I have myself ever previously seen. Now, in the matter of the selection of bishops it is clear that there are two principles that we must preserve. One is the principle of a due regard for locality, local desires, local acquaintance, and local efficiency. The other is the regard for that backing of the whole Church that will secure and preserve for any bishop who may be selected not only the local indorsement, but the general approval. Holding fast to those two principles to be obtained, by whatever process may be decided upon in this body, I think we can go further. There are two or three ways of expressing that local sentiment. We have been sort of fumbling our way along the best we could. We never had anything of this kind before; and therefore, not knowing the way, we have necessarily fumbled our way at several points because we could not do anything else. We have had it in our mind that either we had to nominate the bishops by Regional Conferences meeting months before the General Conference, and then have a period of incredible confusion or uncertainty and possibly politics following, or that we had to elect by the Regional Conferences, subject to the confirmation and consecration by the General Conference a year or two later, leaving the man thus elected in the oddest position in the world of being for a year or two hung up between two places.

Bishop Hamilton: Just as Bishop Hoss was?

Bishop McDowell: Or, to take another case before us, the selection by Regional Conferences at the General Conference and the confirmation by the General Conference of the selection made by the Regional Conference men. But now, brothers, that action of the General Conference must be just as real in its relation to the episcopacy as the actions of the original Conference. Neither can be formal. We have assumed a little bit, and in certain phases of it it would be true that the action of the General Conference would be formal. Neither action ought to be formal. Both actions ought to be real; and I say frankly that the bishop ought to be a man who has the approval of the section, not simply from which he comes, but to which he goes, and sometimes it has not been so. Sometimes men have been chosen under the influence of sections that did not particularly want them returned to them as bishops. It is a mighty good thing if the bishop not only has the backing of the section or neighborhood from which he comes, but also of the section in which he may be stationed. But, in view of the fact that he must go everywhere in the Church

in the administration of the episcopal plan in the hands of the College of Bishops, he ought also to have the full, generous, and hearty approval of the General Conference itself. Now, there is another item to which I ought to call attention at this point. In the beginning of the new relation I think it is particularly important that the bishops who have the local backing in the matter of their selection shall have the most real approval of the General Conference. I think it is more important that that shall happen now than after we have been running for forty years. It is very much more important now; for if in the administration a Bishop has been chosen by a section or neighborhood and the Board of Bishops want him to do a difficult task in a section to which he has not been related at all and, therefore, he has no obligations and no personal prejudices and no friendships to reward and no enemies to punish, but is absolutely without prejudice which may affect the best of men—say that such a man is sent from a certain section to the Atlanta section—the Atlanta section ought not to be able to say, Who is this man coming with nothing but his section's backing behind him, especially in the beginning, when we are working our way through to a better acquaintance? The man should have the double backing of the local section and the most genuine approval of the General Conference. I am not at all concerned as to the method by which that shall be obtained or as to the words securing it; but we have to hold to the principle, and I rose chiefly to say that what has been said here this morning has been most luminous to a mind that has craved light, some of which it gets for the first time this afternoon. I believe Brother Maddin's suggestion and Brother Hyer's suggestion taken together at least throw a light some distance down that path. What Brother Maddin has said is true with reference to what we shall probably do first. But it will be an awfully distressing thing to me after we are one that the years should come and the years go (and there are not very many of them for me any more) without my actually having the privilege of administration in that South with which we definitely and distinctly and earnestly long to be united. I want, therefore, that kind of unification that will most rapidly overlap all barriers, that will most surely regard and preserve that local sentiment that we cannot disregard, but that will most surely preserve that general unity without which we shall never have any unity at all.

Bishop Hamilton: This is beginning to be a genuine love feast. I am intensely interested in the trend in that direction. I was more than pleased with Bishop Mouzon's first statement, because I saw it was an opening through which some of us might possibly squeeze in. I have been pleased with everything that has been said because of the spirit in which it has been said, and I want to ask Brother Hyer a question before I say the very few things

I desire to say. Did I understand you to say that the members of the Regional Conference were to be members of the General Conference?

R. S. Hyer: I rather reversed that proposition. I said the members of the Annual Conference from those regions, who had been sent as delegates to the General Conference, might at the General Conference sit as a Regional Conference for the purpose of election.

Bishop Hamilton: You do not intend that they should be delegates to the General Conference?

R. S. Hyer: Yes.

Bishop Hamilton: Very good. I like that idea very much, and I see no very great difficulty in the way of getting together on Dr. Downey's amendment, that being the case. Let me tell you why: In the first place, I have no sort of feeling that there will ever be any denial of an election of the General Conference when the Regional Conferences have nominated. I will tell you why. We have had experience in that direction. We have elected missionary bishops for our foreign administrations upon the nominations of the mission territory, and in almost every instance the men in the field have been elected. But in the case of Bishop Eveland he was really elected on the nomination of a single man, and I do not believe that one in one hundred of that General Conference knew that Bishop Eveland was to be nominated as a candidate for missionary bishop; but when Dr. Oldham took the floor and stated his conversation and interview with Brother Eveland and nominated him, he was elected on the first ballot. I have not any thought at all that in the future in our Church there will be any question about the missionary territories in determining missionary bishops unless there were some very exceptional reason, and that exceptional reason would possibly justify another election. Now, when you brethren come up there under the circumstances to bring us together, there will be another reason why we should not occasion any offense, and I think the last thing that the first General Conference would ever expect to do would be to dispute with you concerning your nominations. I feel that it would be certain of election to have you brethren nominate your men. Now, there is this other side to it: If you elect, you have practically a diocesan election, if not a diocesan episcopacy. Here is a case in which the rector of a Church in New York has been elected by the Buffalo Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and after holding them up for some thirty days he comes out and declines. Why? For the same reason that Dr. Mann declined previously to be the successor of Phillips Brooks. He would rather be rector in his church in New York City than to be located in the diocese at Buffalo. Of course he would, and there is no question about

that; but if he had been elected by the whole Protestant Episcopal Church and assigned to Buffalo, it would have made a great difference. Diocesan episcopacy is what none of us want and for this reason. You may say what you please about that experience of the New York Church (and we are all guided by our experience); if it differs from ours, it differs very materially. I have, during the sixteen years I have been in the episcopacy, been selected more than half a dozen times to go into territory where I found the worst complications that I ever found in my episcopacy. I was at three Church crowds—one against the pastor of the First Church, another against the district superintendent of the largest district, and another equally large—and I was sent there because I did not know a single thing about either one of them and because the man on the ground never could have settled it if he had been there until judgment day; and he knew it, and he came and asked me to do it, and before I left I transferred twenty-seven men in and out of the Conference and scattered them all over the country from California to New York. You may talk about arbitrary appointments, but it made that territory and made that city scarcely second to any Methodist city in the United States; and when the bishop came to me afterwards he said: "Where did you get these men? and where are my friends?" And I said: "Where are your enemies?" That was a fact, and that Conference invited the General Conference there, and we have never been more magnificently entertained than there. I can conceive from what I think I have heard through some of the administration of some of your bishops that it wouldn't be just and wise for some men to go back to the same Conference when they had held it before.

Bishop Denny: You cannot believe all you hear.

Bishop Hamilton: That may not be, but it is not necessary to believe all of it. Half of it is enough.

Henry Wade Rogers: What is the motion before the house?

Bishop Hamilton: I will get to it by and by. I am summing up the whole thing and trying to get something that we can agree upon. I do really feel that, without having talked to the members of our delegation, if we can get sufficient together to have the suggestion offered by Mr. Maddin and the suggestion offered by Dr. Downey and that further modified by Brother Mouzon's suggestion into one, then we can all agree and vote unanimously. Is it possible to do that and avoid contradictions? I think it is, and I am ready so far as I am concerned to take the responsibility, as the representative of the territory back of me, to come to an agreement with you brethren if you can get around to something like that.

Claudius B. Spencer: I have just one word to say that I think is of value. While this discussion has been going on I have been

reflecting upon this general proposition. I have asked myself what constitutes a bishop according to the Northern and Southern Churches. On reflection, I remember that it is not an election simply, but it is an election plus an ordination. If, therefore, the election were by Regional Conferences and the consecration by the General Conference, it seems to me that meets the technical difficulty in a way. For example, James R. Day and Joshua Soule were not made bishops simply by election. Joshua Soule was elected a second time before he came to be a bishop. It will be impossible for us to speak of Bishop Day for the reason that the process was not completed. If, therefore, the election should be by the Regional Conferences and confirmed by the General Conference and the General Conference itself participated in the ordination of that man, it would seem to me it would meet all the technical difficulties that arise out of the precise language of the third Restrictive Rule. It seems to me as if the suggestion of Bishop Mouzon should be a little differently phrased, because that makes it mandatory, practically speaking. "And he shall be bishop unless rejected," is the idea, by a two-thirds vote of the General Conference. It seems to me that makes it mandatory and that that language should be restricted somewhat.

Alexander Simpson, Jr., was recognized by the Chair.

E. B. Chappell: I rise to a point of order. Under what rules are we operating? Was not there a rule that no one should speak a second time on the same subject?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I have not spoken once, and I don't intend to now; but since I have come in here my heart has been singing the long-meter doxology as it has not sung it for years, and I offer this resolution:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Conferences be referred back to the Committee to consider and report, with the assistance of Mr. Maddin and Dr. Hyer.

A. J. Lamar: I suggest that that is referring the whole report back to the Committee. Would it not be better to refer this question to a special committee consisting of these brethren to suggest an amendment and let them work an amendment into one continuous whole? I think that would be a better plan.

Bishop McDowell: I think Mr. Simpson's motion is a wise one. It is clear that the settlement of this matter now before us will profoundly affect the whole report, and in referring this question back to the Committee we should suspend the discussion of the whole report until that Committee brings back this report upon this special matter.

The time for adjournment being about to arrive, on motion the time was extended.

A further vote being taken, the motion to recommit was carried.

W. N. Ainsworth: I move that in the future proceedings of this Joint Commission speeches be limited to ten minutes for each individual.

Bishop McDowell: That is the rule already.

W. N. Ainsworth: We haven't been obeying it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): No, we haven't; but it has been the Chairman's fault.

Bishop McDowell: May I ask the Committee to remain a moment upon adjournment in order that we may provide for a prompt meeting for the consideration of these various suggestions?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): On this Committee representing the Southern Church was Bishop Hess, who is providentially away, and it becomes my duty to appoint a substitute in his place. I therefore name Bishop Denny to take Bishop Hess's place on that Committee.

Rolla V. Watt: Will it be possible for us to fix the time for reassembling?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Hardly.

Rolla V. Watt: Can we discuss any other question while that Committee is out?

Several Commissioners: No.

Rolla V. Watt: Then I move that we adjourn until three o'clock.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried, and the Joint Commission received the benediction from Dr. Van Cleve, as follows:

J. W. Van Cleve: The peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, and may the blessing of God Almighty, the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, abide with us forever! Amen.

At the close of service.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman (Bishop Candler), and Hymn No. 11 was sung.

Prayer was offered by T. N. Ivy. Our Heavenly Father, thou hast taught us that it is not by might nor by power, but by thy Spirit that we bring about great purposes. And so we ask thee this evening for the spirit of love. May we as we love our common Methodism love each other and, above all, love thee. We know that we cannot love thee unless we love one another. We know that we cannot love one another without loving thee. O Spirit of love in Christ our Lord, come and take possession of us during these services and during the succeeding services, and, O

Spiritual Power, wilt thou be in our midst? We have problems before us; we have walls to level; we have great things to do in thy name, and we know not how. We do not see the way, but thou canst show us the way. Thou canst level the walls; thou canst give us the power to climb hillsides; thou wilt give us, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Heavenly Father, that power which may enable us to glorify thy name in the united Methodism; and grant that this Spirit of loving power may be with us this afternoon especially, and unto thy great name we will give honor and praise for Jesus's sake. Amen.

Prayer by Dr. Frank Neff was offered, as follows: Our Heavenly Father, we are glad this afternoon that we have the privilege of calling ourselves thy children and lifting up our hearts to thee in prayer, calling thee our Father. O God, we know what it means to have a Father who loves and cares for us, and we are so glad that thou dost permit us to come as thy children. We come this afternoon into this service with grateful hearts for all that thou hast done for us and for all of thy mercies throughout all the years and for all the promises of the future and for eternal life. We are here to-day with grateful hearts as we gather in council together, praying, O God, that thou wouldst lead us in such a way that we may work out what may be for the larger interest of the kingdom of God. Help us as brothers, help us as saved by the common blood of our Saviour, help us as the sons of one Father, to come very close together and very close to thee, O God; and lead us in all wisdom, we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

Hymn No. 234, "My Faith Looks up to Thee," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Secretary will now call the roll.

C. M. Bishop: Did not we pass a motion that we should do away with the roll call?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I understood it was only to be that roll call.

Bishop Cooke: I make that motion now for the rest of the sessions.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

A. J. Nast: Bishop McDowell requested me to announce to the joint session that the Joint Committee was not quite ready to report.

Bishop Denny: I did not know the Committee was in session. They didn't send me word. How was I going to know that they were having a meeting?

Bishop Mouzon: I move that we take a recess until 4:30 o'clock.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Joint Commission reconvened pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Cranston.

The Hymn "O Happy Day" was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Is the Committee ready to report?

Bishop McDowell : The Committee has completed its work in substance. We require a little time in order to prepare some figures to present concretely and specifically the question of actual representation in the reorganized Church; and we ask you to adjourn until eight o'clock this evening, by which time our report will be fully completed.

John F. Goucher : I wish the Committee would make an outline of its report, so that we would have it in mind.

Bishop McDowell : Is that the desire of the meeting?

Several Commissioners indicated in the affirmative.

Bishop McDowell : Is the Committee willing to grant this?

Bishop Denny : I think that would be quite helpful.

Bishop McDowell : Unless there is objection, I will ask Dr. Blake, the Secretary of the Subcommittee, Dr. Blake having the record in this case instead of the secretary of the whole committee, to make the statement.

Bishop Denny : Before Dr. Blake begins I may say that it was the understanding of every member of the Committee that the approval of the Committee was tentative and that nobody was bound to support what was done unless what was finally done met his approbation.

Bishop Hamilton : And we are just to hear the report now and no questions raised at this time.

Bishop McDowell : We prefer very much that the report should not now be debated, because certain features require the presentation of more accurate figures than we could get.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : With that understanding we will hear Dr. Blake outline the proposed changes.

Edgar Blake : It will be understood, of course, that this matter is not in finished form. I am simply reading from hurriedly made notes. Section 2 is changed to read as follows :

Each Regional Conference shall be composed of the ministerial and lay delegates elected to the General Conference by the several Annual Conferences within the territory of said Regional Conferences.

Now, if you will turn to the "Powers":

(3) Each Regional Conference, through its representatives in the General Conference, shall have the power from time to time to elect the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference according to uniform principles, and such bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conferences and ordained by the bishops unless two-thirds of the members of the General Conference present and voting shall object to such confirmation.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 289

(4) Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctively local affairs within its jurisdiction, including the power to fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and to provide for the organization of the same, provided that no new Annual Conference shall be organized with less than fifteen thousand Church members in full connection. The Regional Conference, through its representatives in the General Conference shall meet for organization immediately succeeding the organization of the General Conference and at such other times and places as the Regional Conference itself shall determine.

The next heading is "Presiding Officer":

The effective bishop resident in the Regional Conference shall preside over the session of the Regional Conference in such order as the bishops themselves may determine.

Quorum.

Whenever a Regional Conference is in session it shall require the presence of two-thirds of the whole number for the transaction of business, but a less number may take a recess or adjourn from time to time or approve the journal at the final session of the Regional Conference.

(8) All matters of procedure shall be governed by such rules and regulations as the Regional Conference shall from time to time prescribe.

Now turn over to the section on the General Conference "Powers":

Subsection (7) : To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy, to fix according to uniform principle the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, and to confirm and retire the same, provided that a bishop shall be assigned for regional supervision to the Regional Jurisdiction by which he was elected, but any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendent to any Annual Conference for residential supervision, provided that the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which said bishop is assigned shall concur in said assignment.

That is all.

Bishop Denny: There is one matter that I cannot claim to be of any special moment, and yet when taste is involved I feel like calling attention to it.. I have not forgotten my old friend Horace, though I shall not undertake to quote him, although I might be able to quote him on that point if it were necessary. There is something in ecclesiastical history as well as in educational history that gives a very honorable association to the term "college" which is not found in the term "board," and it seems to me that we should lose nothing and might gain whatever association is connected with that word if instead of calling the bishops a "Board of Bishops" we call them a "College of Bishops." I suggest that, though I don't move it.

On motion, duly seconded, the convention adjourned until eight o'clock this evening and was dismissed with benediction by Dr. Wallace.

NIGHT SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by Bishop Cranston pursuant to adjournment, and Hymn No. 207 was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Bishop Cooke will lead us in prayer.

Bishop Cooke : Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for this day. We thank thee for the consciousness of the presence of thy Spirit and all the blessings which have played upon our minds and hearts. We thank thee for the life and health and strength which have been given to us; and now that we are gathered here and the shades of night are about us, may the quiet and peace of our Christ settle down upon us. Unite us in our hearts, O Lord; strengthen our resolves; quicken our minds to the things we ought to do, and give us grace, O Lord, to do these things. Bless thy Church, the Church of God, the Church of the Holy Ghost in the earth for the redemption of the earth. Bless thy ministers. Bless all the forces which make for the coming of the King. Bless our families. Bless our friends and loved ones, and may the wings of God shelter us this night, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I will read the lesson from St. John :

Then said Jesus unto them, Yet a little while I am with you, and then I go unto him that sent me.

Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me; and where I am thither ye cannot come.

Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will he go, that we cannot find him? Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles and lead the Gentiles?

What manner of saying is this that he said, Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come?

Hymn No. 530, "O Thou, in Whose Presence My Soul Takes Delight, on Whom in Affliction I Call," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We will now join in prayer with Bishop Mouzon.

Bishop Mouzon : Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, God of our fathers, we worship thee as our Father and our God. We come before thee with gratitude. Thy goodness and mercy have followed us all our days. We have been unworthy; we are unworthy of the very least of all thy mercies and thy truth. But thou hast forgiven our sins and blotted out our transgressions; thou hast written our names in the Lamb's book of life; thou hast given us the witness of thy Holy Spirit with our spirit that we are the children of God; thou hast called us to labor in the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ; thou hast committed to us the interests of thy kingdom. We are unworthy of these trusts which thou hast committed to

us, and we feel at this time that one of the most solemn trusts that have ever been committed to us is now laid upon us. We feel that one of the holiest privileges that have ever come to us has come to us now. We feel that we are under the highest obligations to thee and to our brethren, to the Churches we represent, to labor with an eye single to God's glory and to discharge in sincerity and straightforwardness the trust which our Churches have laid upon us. God, give us wisdom. God, enlighten the blindness of our minds with the knowledge of thy strength, of thy truth, and in thy light may we see light. O God, help us, that we may know what is best to be done. Give us wisdom, that we may know what Israel ought to do. Bind our hearts together in the bonds of Christian love. Grant, we beseech thee, that while we are laboring here we may learn to love one another more truly and that we may learn to love thee, O God, more truly. Guide us, we beseech thee, in the deliberations of this hour, for we ask all these things in Christ's name. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We will have the journal read.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

Bishop Candler here took the chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I suppose the order before you is hearing the report which was adjourned to this time.

Bishop McDowell : We committed that report for the perfecting of it to a small subcommittee, and I do not see them present.

Dr. Edgar Blake here entered the room.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Here is the small subcommittee.

Bishop McDowell : The subcommittee was Dr. Blake, Dr. Hyer, Mr. Simpson, and Dr. Chappell, and they have been at work upon it. That was the small committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I suppose the Committee is ready to give us that report. Perhaps we had better hear from some member of the Committee.

John M. Moore : We will distribute what we have here now.

Abram W. Harris : I have a letter from the Laymen's Association, Newark Conference.

The letter was read and filed.

Edgar Blake : Will you permit a word of explanation?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Dr. Blake of the Committee wants a word of explanation. The Commission should hear him.

Edgar Blake : I simply desire to say that the remainder of the Committee's report is now being put into typewritten form and will be here, I think, before we are ready to act upon it. I came as quickly as I could with the first three sections of the report, thinking that we could begin work upon those sections at once.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): What is your pleasure as to the method of procedure dealing with the report? Without objection it will be taken up by items. The first is before you; and I do not suppose you want it read, as you have it.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I move to adopt that item.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: Permit me just a word of explanation. Will the brethren turn to their regular sheets, Section 2, "Membership," page 3, beginning "Each Regional Conference shall be composed of one ministerial and one lay delegate"— This item I have just read will take the place of the entire Section 2 in your present report.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion is made to approve this section.

Bishop Denny: What becomes of the qualifications?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That comes under the General Conference report.

W. N. Ainsworth: I should like to know before my approval can be given to it just about the number of delegates this would put in the Regional Conference. It will come out later, but I would like to know now, as it has a bearing on this.

Bishop McDowell: Dr. Blake will answer.

Edgar Blake: I regret that that section providing for the composition of the General Conference is not ready to put before you, but I think I can state it in substance. The subcommittee is recommending that the General Conference be composed of one ministerial and one lay delegate from each Regional Jurisdiction for each 14,000 Church members in full connection therewith or a fraction of two-thirds thereof, provided that no Regional Conference shall have less than one hundred members in the first session of the General Conference. We are also providing that the number of delegates to which a Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled shall be apportioned among the Annual Conferences of the Jurisdiction and elected by them, apportioned on the number of Church membership in full connection. Now, on that basis, with the figures based upon the returns of 1915, and not including probationers, Regional Jurisdiction No. 1 would have 144; No. 2, 114; No. 3, 126; No. 4, 154; No. 5, 100; No. 6, 110—making a total of 740.

Edwin M. Randall: The ratio is one to every fourteen thousand members?

Edgar Blake: The Subcommittee recommends one ministerial and one lay delegate for each 14,000 Church members in full connection. This 740 does not include the four missionary or local jurisdictions; and the four missionary or local jurisdictions, on the same basis, would have a total of 32 additional.

Bishop Cranston: The only objection or the only question I have heard raised that is pertinent to speak of here would be as to the size of one of the Jurisdictional or Regional Conferences. I speak of the Northwest, which is on the mind of Dr. Randall as related to the general scheme, and especially to the powers and duties of the Regional Conferences. That territory is tremendous. If it were decided that the Regional Conference should meet twice in a quadrennium, that body could come together only at great expense. My own judgment is that there is no necessity for Regional Conferences to meet more than once, and it might meet with the General Conference, and I cannot see why it should not there also perform its legislative functions.

Bishop McDowell: You are evidently laboring under a misapprehension, for that is exactly what we have proposed. It is proposed that there shall not be biennial but quadrennial meetings.

Bishop Cranston: But there should be some provision in describing the powers of the Regional Conferences by which the administrative duties of the Conferences or the executive duties, if it had any, could be performed by subordinate bodies for given areas without so large an expense.

Edgar Blake: That, I think, is covered in the powers given to the Regional Conferences.

Bishop Cranston: Where?

Edgar Blake: We will come to that in the next session.

Bishop Cranston: Then I have nothing further to say. I was afraid the matter had been overlooked.

Edgar Blake: I think it has not.

Bishop Cranston: This vast territory, which will be two or three Regional Conferences after a while, ought to have legislation so framed that its business could be carried forward without so much expense.

A. J. Lamar: I do not know whether anybody besides a few of us think so or not; but two or three of us have been talking about it, and that is a very large body. I think five hundred would be a much more effective body and much more economical. Personally I would like three hundred. I think a body of that size could do our work and in less time.

Bishop McDowell: May I state the principle which led the Committee to which this matter was recommended to adopt this plan that Dr. Blake has just presented? It will be recalled that there was quite a discussion during the forenoon, and at the end of the discussion the whole subject was recommitted, together with all the suggestions that any one has presented here. We had originally contemplated a smaller General Conference. We had originally contemplated also rather more elaborate Jurisdictional Conferences and more frequent meetings. The discussion this

morning disclosed a very widespread judgment within the Joint Commission to the effect that the members of the Regional Conferences might fairly constitute the delegates to the General Conference and might, therefore, have their meetings at the same time and place at which the General Conference would be in session, and that would obviate the necessity for the extra meetings of the Regional Conferences and consequently obviate the expense and time and money. In view of that change of general plan, it was felt in the Committee this afternoon that we could wisely—indeed, that we must—provide for a larger General Conference in view of the powers that should be given to the General Conferences on the new basis. That is to say, it seemed to be the consensus of opinion this morning that the bishops should be elected by the Regional Conferences subject to the confirmation at the hands of the General Conference. Now, in a small General Conference the members of the Regional Conference present at that session might constitute, and on the original basis would constitute, a rather small number. I think one of those regional areas had less than fifty-six delegates. It was thought that we ought not to put into the hands of fifty-six persons the business of electing bishops, even though that election should be subject to confirmation for the agreed area and agreed region and agreed section of the country. In looking at the numerical strength of the different Regional Conferences as tentatively approved earlier, it appeared to us that, starting with the basis that has found expression in one ministerial and one lay delegate for each fourteen thousand, a Regional Conference having seven hundred and some thousand members would have a little more than a hundred delegates in the Conference and consequently that this number (one hundred) would constitute a more just and equitable number to constitute a Regional Conference with the important duties that were attached to the Regional Conferences in the plan that was the result of the morning discussion. It was further felt that eliminating the expense of the extra session of the Regional Conference we could fairly incur a little extra expense in having a larger General Conference. It was further felt that with the elimination of certain of the legislative functions of the Regional Conferences and the combination of those functions with the double duties of Regional Conference membership and General Conference membership, the number ought to be larger so as to be more perfectly representative, and it was further felt that a body as large as the united Church would be, a body composed of six million people to start with, ought not to be a small body, ought not to be represented by a General Conference small in number, that the General Conference should be most thoroughly

representative and, being both General and Regional Conference, performing both duties, we could very well start upon the plan with a minimum of seven hundred instead of a lesser minimum. Our own General Conference had more than eight hundred members in it. It was felt that this basis would work out in a way equitable to each of the regions and give a sufficient number to give a dignified basis for the transaction of the business that would be in their hands and would make their action much more representative both for the regions and the whole Church than would be possible if the numbers were smaller.

Edwin M. Randall: May I ask a question for information? I am indebted to Brother Ainsworth for a memorandum of the figures of the membership given out for these areas, and it appears by that that the area of Region No. 5 contains a membership of 773,000.

Edgar Blake: 700,773.

Edwin M. Randall: I say there was a difference of ten from the next one, which was rather large for a difference of only four thousand.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Are you ready for the question?

A vote being taken, the motion before the Joint Commission was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The next item is Section 3.

Edgar Blake: If the brethren will kindly turn to that—

Bishop Cranston: Now, you are eliminating all the rest down to this?

Edgar Blake: Yes. The page just handed you is to take the place of the page under "Powers," Section 3. It reads as follows:

Each Regional Conference shall have power to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference according to a uniform principle, and said bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conference and ordained by the bishops, unless two-thirds of the members of the General Conference present and voting shall object to said confirmation.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I do not like to suggest changes in a document prepared as this has been; but in the very excellent speech made by Bishop McDowell, in which a great many of us concurred, the statement was made that a man who goes out as bishop of the whole Church ought to have behind him the approval of the area and the approval of the whole Church. That might happen under this rule, and it might not happen. It might happen that a man might go out with the approval of only one-third of the Church. I do not know whether the suggestion I wish to make will relieve this situation at all or not; but if it could be

done, I would like to accomplish that result. I think we might give to each Regional Conference the power to nominate twice the number of bishops allotted to it. Under the present system very little time elapses between the time of nomination and election, and the General Conference is required to choose from this number the number actually required. There would be no question of acceptance or rejection. The man chosen would be a man whom his area and the General Conference both think fitted for the position. I do not see how we can secure both things that Bishop McDowell spoke of this morning otherwise. I move that as an amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : Is there a second?

The amendment was seconded.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: It would read then: "Insert twice the number of appointees, and from this number of candidates the General Conference shall elect the number of bishops" and strike out the two-thirds provision, and the matter is closed right there, with the exception of the matter of ordination.

Dr. Goucher: There are many persons in the ministry, and they are not among those least desirable, who would not consent to have their names presented as candidates when there was only a fifty per cent chance of their being chosen. I hardly think a man who was worthy of the office would be willing to allow his name to be used under those circumstances.

W. N. Ainsworth: I would like information at this point. Does paragraph 4, (11), of the Committee's report remain in this plan? It has a bearing on any action that may be taken in the General Conference. It is "vote by regional delegation." Does that remain in?

Edgar Blake: That has not been considered by the Committee.

W. N. Ainsworth: Then it remains a part of the report?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

W. N. Ainsworth: If that remains part of the report, I can vote for the measure before it because it has a decided action upon the action of the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: What Dr. Ainsworth says should not be taken to mean that approval of the present matter implies approval of the other paragraph when we come to it.

W. N. Ainsworth: Except that my personal approval of the present paragraph depends upon the other.

Bishop McDowell: At the same time it is fair to say we are considering the matter paragraph by paragraph, and I don't want to give tacit consent to a statement of Dr. Ainsworth that the approval of this matter depends on the approval of anything to follow.

Bishop Cranston: Referring to the matter brought before us

by Dr. Van Cleve has drawn my attention to the fact that there is nothing said about how the General Conference shall express its approval.

Rolla V. Watt: We are not dealing with the duties of the General Conference now.

Bishop Cranston: I understand that; but it is not out of order for me to say why that expression by the General Conference by ballot would, it seems to me, carry more weight and would go before the Church as affording more dignified and significant confirmation than a stand-up vote in the body, and I would like to see it put into that clause that the confirmation should be by ballot, and that would indicate also whether the two-thirds had been given.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I have been so much impressed by the last statement of Dr. Goucher that, with the consent of my second, I will withdraw the amendment. Dr. Goucher says qualified men would not want to take a fifty-fifty chance.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The amendment is withdrawn.

A vote being taken, the section was agreed to.

Edgar Blake (reading):

Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction, including the power to fix the boundaries of Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and to provide for the organization of the same, provided that no new Annual Conference shall be organized with less than fourteen thousand Church members in full connection therewith.

No Regional Conference shall make any rule or regulation contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, this simply supersedes this list of powers with blank powers or powers given in blank form.

John M. Moore: I would ask Dr. Blake, Do you mean to say under that statement that the Regional Conferences shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction? that under that you really include all these powers that are specified?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

Edwin M. Randall: This brings up the aspect of the matter in which I am especially interested. The area you have given in that Northwestern country is of the modest extent of 1,974,308 square miles, not including Hawaii. Just within this principal part of the United States, not including Alaska, we have a territory that is very nearly rectilinear, two thousand miles one way and a thousand miles the other. Along the Pacific Coast it is fairly well settled with a large and rapidly growing population.

Then it has a large and growing population over the Eastern one-third; and then separating these two populations and making them more difficult of access to each other is the belt running entirely across it, about a thousand miles or thereabouts wide, of mountain and desert region. To hold a Jurisdictional Conference in the interim of the General Conference there would be an extraordinarily expensive and difficult affair, and the contemplation of any such necessity would assure our prospect here of a solid adverse vote all through that territory.

Edgar Blake: I do not catch that.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I said the necessity of a session of our Regional Conference in the interim of the General Conference would be an exceedingly expensive and troublesome thing.

Henry Wade Rogers: Don't hold it, then.

Edwin M. Randall: And the contemplation of such a necessity would assure a very general, if not nearly a unanimous, opposition to this plan.

Edgar Blake: You don't have to hold it. It is left to them to decide.

Edwin M. Randall: Here is what I want to call attention to and that I wish kept in mind, and that is my principal reason for calling attention to it now. This is subject to restrictions and limitations and is dependent also upon the interpretation that may be made for that region, the interpretation that may be placed upon the extent of the local affairs. I believe that it can easily be arranged, and I believe this body of brethren will desire to help us out and to simplify our affairs by putting this in such shape that it will be clear to our people out there that we will need no session of that body except at the General Conference. That being the case, it would eliminate any objection of this section for us in that great big area. And I speak of this because I do wish that the plan that goes through this body may be as clear as sunlight in its adaptation to our condition, for the Lord knows I do want unification.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: If you will read the next section, it exactly covers it.

Edwin M. Randall: That shows, it is true, in regard to its purposes; and what I desire this evening is to call your attention to that; and with the hope and expectation that in the working out of the constitution you have us in mind out there and make it as simple and helpful for us as possible and anticipating that, I shall cheerfully and heartily support this provision to the end.

Rolla V. Watt: Speaking from the same district, I rather welcome the change made, because it made it necessary for us to contemplate some of the duties set forth for the Regional Conferences. When I read the list included in the five Regional

Conferences, I saw there could not be any hope of much legislative action for that specific district. To illustrate: The district includes Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, and Alaska—fifteen States and Hawaii and Alaska. The schools and the public interests on the Pacific Coast are just as different from those of the Mississippi Valley as can be. The universities and the standards of education are dissimilar; but as to the management and control of educational institutions of California, Washington, and Colorado, they are different from each other. I need not say how we are going to work out the plans originally suggested. This is much broader, and we should do the things in the Regional Conference that are necessary to be done and leave to the Annual Conference the problems that belong to it. I do not see anything serious about it. The only thing that bothers me is that we have the greatest territory in the United States and the smallest delegation.

David G. Downey: I want to make an answer to an observation made by Dr. Moore a while ago. Dr. Moore inquired whether this Section 4 included all the parts that were originally mapped out in Section 3 of the powers of the Regional Conference. Dr. Blake replied that it did and more. I should not want that statement to go without some word of comment. I would not want any one in the future who should preserve this document to claim that everything near under the powers as originally drafted belong under the present Section 4. I was decidedly opposed to the report in its original form because it seems to me that the powers granted to the Regional Conferences and the powers granted to the General Conference were in some respects contradictory or at least that there was a very great possibility of contest. Now, we find here in Section 4 that the only power that is specified here is "fixing the boundaries of Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions and to provide for the organization of the same." The rest is, "They shall have full legislative power over distinctly local affairs," with this important proviso, "not contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church." The point I wish to make is that this grant of power over distinctly local affairs is largely dependent upon the powers granted to the General Conference. Of course the powers granted to the General Conference will be connectional, and there could be no grant of power to the Regional Conferences that conflicts with the granting power to the General Conference, and I take it that what we need to bear in mind is that whatever is not specifically granted to the General Conference belongs, if it is not connectional and

does not contravene the connectional affairs, to the Regional Conferences. But it is not specified. It is a matter that has to be determined in the future by the various Regional Conferences and in allegiance to the grant of powers made to the General Conference. I do not believe it is safe for us to assert categorically that every one of these powers and more appear in the present Section 4. Possibly they do and possibly not. That is a matter of interpretation and experience for the future.

Bishop Hamilton: I want to ask some questions concerning some matters that have not been raised here at all. I suspect that you intend to start off at least with the Annual Conferences existing as they are both in this country and foreign lands. Now, you, of course, have not adopted the number nor the boundary of the Regional Conferences, but, indicated as they are in the report, you are intending to put all of Europe into one region, and you will have to send more of any army and navy than we now have over there to get them to meet. We have to send two bishops and possibly three to hold what Annual Conferences they will want to have over there. And that is not the only thing. If we start with the Conferences as we have them now, some of those districts don't have 10,400, and some of them probably never will because of the national boundary. If with these existing Conferences undisturbed you never let another Conference be organized without 14,000, you will have difficulties that you cannot manage if the General Conference is to have control of this matter and not the Regional Conferences. Now, I simply ask the question, Did you take into account these Annual Conferences? Now, there is another thing that I want to bring before you for an answer. And it is not a question that is trifling. You have paid no attention in the report either to the Germans in this country or to the Scandinavians in this country, and you have some great Regional Conferences here, and they will be lapping into one another. I don't see how you are going to compass this matter with Conferences of foreign-speaking tongues unless you leave them without a region and let the Annual Conferences themselves have delegates in the General Conference; and I am asking the question, Did you consider these matters? And if so, is it to be understood that if some of the Conferences are existing in foreign countries they shall continue to exist with half or one-third of the number, but that no new Conference shall be created without 14,000? And what are you going to do with the foreign-speaking people in this country?

Henry Wade Rogers: Your objection would be met by amending the provision of Section 4 so as to say "provided no new Annual Conference shall be organized in the United States with less than," etc.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 301

Bishop Hamilton: I am bringing attention, not to make a motion, but to see that it is taken care of before we get to the question of the other Conferences not mentioned here together with the foreign-speaking members here.

Albert J. Nast: Bishop Hamilton's calling attention to this fact, that in the creation of the Regional Conferences our ten German Conferences in this country are partly contained in them, and as Dr. Downey has wanted a definite answer upon the question whether the original document here describes the powers of the Regional Conferences obtained in the new language of Section 4, that is to say that each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within its jurisdiction. Now, it happens I have looked over the matter and find that in the first Regional Conference there is one entire German Conference, nearly entire, included. In the Second Regional Conference there are two German Conferences, in part. In the third there are none. In the fourth there are two entire German Conferences and two in part. In Regional Conference No. 5 there are five German Conferences, either in whole or in part; and in the sixth Regional Conference there is one entire German Conference, that is the Southern in Texas, and two in part. Now, the question with me is whether this new section implies that the several Regional Conferences shall be empowered to direct and control the benevolent organization enterprises and institutions of these German Conferences. We certainly would feel that we are handicapped in taking care of our institutions. For example, the three — Conferences are German Conferences, and then it has an English Conference to which the school looks for support in part. That Regional Conference embraces Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Shall that whole Regional Conference have control and have power to direct and control the Baltimore College or the Deaconess's Home or the hospital in Cincinnati or our German Orphan Asylum in Berea? It does seem to me that the Conferences have separate rights in their endowed institutions that the Regional Conference ought not to have power to control.

Bishop McDowell: May I say just a word? I think the trend of discussion this morning was to the effect that if we would grant to the Regional Conference these distinctly electoral privileges that have just been provided for and certain administrative privileges which would be very nominal that the legislative functions of the Regional Conference would not be very expensive, and it would almost cease to be, as I understood Mr. Maddin this morning, and the General Conferences would perform those legislative functions that belong to the General Conference. But what Dr. Nast now says would be entirely true—namely, that the Annual Conferences might possibly have a slight addition to

the powers they have heretofore exercised, and certainly no diminution of those powers in the absence of legislative functions that you originally contemplated giving to the Regional Conferences. That was the trend of discussion this morning and was in my mind in making this report this afternoon.

Rolla V. Watt: Were the figures of the German Conferences and the Swedish Conferences and the Norwegian Conferences taken into account for making up the tabulation for representation?

Bishop McDowell: They were taken into account, but not in making these totals of 700,700 members in the given Regional Conferences. That total does not include the German, the Scandinavian, or any special membership for the reason that we recognize those Conferences as constituting a separate class, and it was felt it might possibly be necessary to make a special effort concerning them.

Rolla V. Watt: Make a new Regional Conference for them?

Bishop Cranston: Mr. Chairman, I want to put another question which relates to the schools under the control of the Freedman's Aid Society, which would be found in a number of the jurisdictions. I was wondering how it would do to insert here a provision protecting existing administrations—that is, provided the Regional Conferences should not have power to interfere with the administration of institutions created under charters and already administered according to the spirit of their founders, etc. I do not mean to pull all that in, but I am thinking of the effect on such charters. Of course Regional Conferences would not want to enter into control of the institutions that are protected by the charter that gave those institutions being. If it did, it would mean litigation. I don't think any Regional Conference would ever undertake such a thing, and yet while we are making a constitution it might be well to insert a clause at once that would settle the matter and would cover the case that Dr. Nast suggests. They have their organizations and have founded them and have paid for them and are doing great service.

Bishop McDowell: Neither the General Conference nor the Regional Conference nor the Annual Conferences can disturb existing charters except in accordance with the terms by which they are related to those charters. That is as true as anything in the world.

Bishop Cranston: I think that is true, and yet this constitution will have to go before the entire Church, and there will be hundreds of inquiries on those points, and it is so easy to settle it by a single clause inserted in the right place.

John M. Moore: I have not understood that the Regional Conferences are to be nominal affairs. I do not understand that this arrangement by which the Regional Conference is created

and under which it shall carry forward its work, that this new arrangement shall in any way interfere with the work it was to do. I do not want to have a Regional Conference that will amount to nothing. And when I asked this question whether or not these powers that were outlined in the original document were really comprehended under the new proposition and the answer came, Yes, I was satisfied; but I will not be satisfied if we are simply to have a Regional Conference that has no real purpose except to elect a bishop. We have other matters that need to be carried forward as well as the matters concerning the episcopacy. I think the Regional Conference should have very much to do with the benevolent institutions and enterprises within its territory. I think a Regional Conference should have very much to do with the rules and regulations for the educational work within its territory. I cannot imagine that the Committee ever meant that the Regional Conference should really direct or control the educational institutions within its borders. That would be to give that Regional Conference powers that have never belonged to the General Conference.

David G. Downey : That is in the grant.

John M. Moore : I don't want it with that meaning. No one ever contemplated, so far as I know, that the Regional Conferences should come in and take possession of the educational institutions. There are educational institutions that are so owned and controlled that a Regional Conference could not touch them to-day.

Bishop Cooke : The report provides for the direction and control. Now, to direct and control are very definite terms. Two bodies cannot direct and control. Either the General Conference shall direct and control or the Regional Conference. If the Regional does not, the Annual does; and if the Regional does, that power passes out from all other possessory powers.

John M. Moore : I never understood that that meant that the Regional Conference should really take charge of institutions.

Bishop Cooke : That is what it means.

John M. Moore : Yes, but we have not adopted those words yet. What I think was meant was that the Regional Conference should make provision for carrying on the educational work within its territory. That was the understanding I had, and I think the Regional Conference should be the administrative body through which these institutions of various kinds shall be directed. I do not mean necessarily controlled, and I never want any such power as that for any Regional Conference; but I would like to see the institution under the Regional Conference rather than under the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell : Many of them are distinctly related to and

directed by Annual Conferences and not under the control of the General Conference, except as to the general rule relating to the standardization of the education obtaining throughout the whole Church.

John M. Moore: We have two institutions that are at present what we call connectional institutions. They are under the direction of the General Church. Where would they fall? One is in Texas, and one is in Atlanta. Are those to fall under the General Conference, or shall they become connectional institutions for the Regional Conferences? It seems to me that we should say somewhere that the Regional Conference shall have the direction of the general, benevolent, and educational work within its territory that is not already directed by the Annual Conference, and then I think the Regional Conferences would have power to make certain rules and regulations regarding those institutions and the educational work there. It seems to me we need to define that for them. So Dr. Nast brings us fairly face to face with the matter that we must not make the Regional Conference simply a name, a myth, a nominal thing, but a reality with certain defined provinces and powers.

Bishop Cooke: In a general way I most heartily support what is presented to us, and yet I have a feeling which I think I ought to express because of the large territory over which the Annual Conferences have control. I would like to see the powers which have been granted to the Regional Conferences lodged in the Annual Conference. There is home rule and home talent. I do not know whether I can clearly put before you my thought in the few moments in which I shall speak, because it will be too terse. I want certain powers which are conferred upon the Regional Conferences to be lodged in the Annual Conferences, where the interests, the local interests, are taken care of. The word "local" here is used almost in the universal sense; but when you come to notice the territory, it is not very local when you go from the North Pole to San Diego. The next thing is that no part of that area can be so interested in the charitable institutions in the Annual Conferences and the educational institutions as that Conference in which the money is raised and in which Conference the people sympathize in the founding and support of the institution. I do not care to go any further with a great long speech, because I think we are in a blessed, happy mood again, out of the woods, and I don't want to throw any monkey wrench into the machine.

W. N. Ainsworth: May I ask the Bishop a question?

Bishop Cooke: No; let me get through. I want to put the control of these institutions in the Annual Conference, and to that end I move that instead of "the direction and control" being

in the Regional Conference that "direction and control" be given to the Annual Conference. I don't want to deprive the Regional Conference of oversight of these things because there are forces at work in this world which are destructive of Christian education, and there are influences that can be set to work to take education out of the hands of Christian men and secularize our institutions, and I want to protect our institutions from that sort of thing. The Annual Conferences, when they get a big grant of money, are apt to see the money rather than the good that is back of the whole money; but where there is a larger Conference to take a larger view, the Regional Conference can say No. I therefore would like to move—I don't have any idea that it will be accepted—but I want to fix it that the Regional Conference shall have the power to protect and foster all the educational institutions of that region, not to direct and control, but to protect and promote instead of directing and controlling. Put the direction and control of them in the hands of those Conferences which originated them and largely support them. I move the substitution of the words "foster and protect" instead of "direct and control." Now I shall be pleased to answer Dr. Ainsworth's question.

W. N. Ainsworth: I want to ask this question. If the authority is given to a Regional Conference to direct and control the educational work within its borders, is it not altogether likely that they will charge a part of the Annual Conferences within that jurisdiction with looking after the interests of the institutions within that Conference that distinctly belong to that Conference? Can they not farm out their power, so to speak, from the Regional Conferences to various Annual Conferences beneath them and reach the same end?

Bishop Cooke: In answer to the first part of the question I would say that were that the case the Annual Conference would not need that much, because having the direction and control of it would render such a thing entirely superfluous.

R. E. Blackwell: I think we have all that is needed here. You must remember that we know the working of the Annual Conference, and we also know the workings of the General Conference. Now, we are starting a new piece of machinery, the Regional Conferences, and I think we have all that is necessary in this statement and Section 4 that each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all the distinctively local affairs within its jurisdiction. That Regional Conference is likely to feel the need of special attention to such institutions as have been mentioned, the Texas institution, for instance. If so, they will go to work at it in the range of the Annual Conference that may be supporting it and the General Conference. Now, there are some things we have to follow up, not by legis-

lating here or of thinking of the powers to be given it, but by finding out what is needed. Consequently all that is necessary is to make some general statement of that kind that it has full legislative power over distinctly local affairs. Now, in so far as the Southwestern may be considered and as the Southern Methodist University may be considered a jurisdictional college, that jurisdiction will take care of it, and you may be sure that those who are interested in education in any of the Regional Conferences will be alive to the interest of the case, and I do not think it is necessary to say that they have full power to own or control or any other powers. They have their constitution and everything needed, and all that is necessary is to get some steam back of it or the various Conferences composing the Regional Conferences to support it. I do not think it necessary to say "shall have power to foster and protect." It naturally will do that, and you have said all that is necessary when you say it has power over all distinctly local affairs within the jurisdiction. We should work our way through this and not state what powers are given when we have the powers already mentioned, the powers of the Annual Conference and the powers of the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: I think we are a bit confused at this point in the use of the word "jurisdiction" in this sense. We have spoken of Regional Conferences and Jurisdictional Conferences as synonymous, and we may now be thinking unconsciously possibly that the word "jurisdiction" in this sense is equivalent to "region"; so that what we mean is that each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly local affairs within *the* jurisdiction, though it said *its* jurisdiction. What the Committee meant to say—I am sure that Mr. Simpson and Mr. Maddin will bear me out—was that the Regional Conferences should have full legislative power over distinctly local affairs which came within the jurisdiction of the Regional Conference.

Bishop Cooke: The word "jurisdiction" does not have a territorial meaning.

Bishop McDowell: "No; but "annual" means that the jurisdiction only applies where the Regional Conference has jurisdiction. Of course the Regional Conference could not legislate where the Annual Conference has jurisdiction.

Bishop Cooke: I thank Bishop McDowell for clearing up this matter and regret putting anything into this discussion which has prolonged it. I shall only say that "full legislative power" was what staggered me.

Bishop McDowell: Dr. Blake did not agree with me.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Neither did I.

Edgar Blake: I simply rise to suggest that I don't think Bishop McDowell was interpreting the word here as the Committee un-

derstood it and intended. It was in the minds of the Committee, as I understand it, to mean *the jurisdiction*. I think that would make it perfectly clear if we substitute the word "the" for the word "its." I see no special reason for the unusual confusion. "Direct and control" does not appear here at all.

Bishop McDowell: When you were asked about this as compared with the other, I think your reply led to the natural inquiry as to whether the original list of powers defined and elaborated what is here.

Bishop Cooke: Does it not say so in effect?

Edgar Blake: The question was this: Did the new section confer the same power upon the Jurisdictional Conferences that the former section gave?

John M. Moore: That was the purport of my question.

Edgar Blake: And I answered that it did so. My reason for saying that was that one of our distinguished legal friends said in the Committee this afternoon, as I understood him, that the conferring of power in blank form, if anything gave greater power than if conferred in specific form.

Bishop Cooke: The words "direct and control" are in the other document.

Edgar Blake: Yes.

Bishop Cooke: And powers are conferred there?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

Bishop Cooke: And those are continued here?

Edgar Blake: No. I do not care to discuss the other document, and we all understand that no action that this commission might take or that the General Conference might take or that the Annual Conference might take could in any way interfere with the rights of any institution as those rights are conveyed to that institution in its charter. Now, if you will keep that clearly in mind, that that does not give any Regional Conference the right to interfere in the control or direction of any institution whose charter does not convey to the Regional Conference that right or power, there will be absolutely no confusion here.

Bishop Cooke: That may be clear to Dr. Blake, but would that be clear in court?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: It would. It is as clear as clear can be.

A. J. Lamar: I am honestly puzzled at this point. We have two universities that promise to be great universities. We have accumulated approximately \$3,000,000 for each, and they are only two years old. The title to the property of these two institutions the property of the united Church. There are local recharterers. One of those is located at Atlanta and one at Dallas, Tex. They are within two of these regions. It is very important for us—we would be unwilling, at least I would be positive

ly unwilling to agree to any scheme that would make those institutions the property of the united Church. There are local reasons that enter into that which will immediately appear to each one of us. We must, in the two jurisdictions which contain those two institutions, have the power to direct and control those institutions. They are not Annual Conference institutions. The property is not in the Annual Conference. Their direction and control is not in the Annual Conference. The General Conference elects the Board of Trustees, and the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, owns, directs, and controls. How can you manage that?

Henry Wade Rogers: You have a special charter from the legislature?

A. J. Lamar: No, sir; we haven't because under the laws of both States it is not necessary to have a legislative charter. There are general laws governing such matters.

Henry Wade Rogers: The general laws must make provision for an amendment for your charter. What prevents amending your charter in any such way as you please? This point has been raised, and it has been made clear to most of the members of the Commission that it is utterly impossible by any legislation which may be enacted here or by ratification by the two Churches to direct and control any institution which holds a charter from the State or which is incorporated under the general law because the law of the State has decided that the management of those institutions shall be in the person in whom it has invested that power. It is not for the Church through its General Conference or through its Regional Conference to take from those institutions what the State has granted. Now, you have formed under the general incorporation laws of your State a university. That you have done, acting by yourselves and under the power which the legislature has granted through general laws. You may amend your charter if the general laws make provisions for that in your State and invest the power and control over your university where you please.

A. J. Lamar: Can we put it in the Regional Conference?

E. B. Chappell: I was going to suggest in the first place we want to substitute "the" for "its." Very clearly and in order to make that point clear I had already written down what Dr. Lamar refers to, that we might then add after the word "same" in the third line from the bottom of that paragraph "and to establish, own, and control educational and benevolent institutions." We ought distinctly to confer that power upon the Regional Conferences, as then there would not be any doubt about it, and I move that in addition and then this further amendment that we put instead of "its jurisdiction" "the area."

Bishop Denny: I second that motion about the area.

David G. Downey: I rise to speak on this amendment.

John F. Goucher: Take one at a time. I second that about the area.

Bishop Cranston: If this means what was stated under the original matter, if that is actually implied in this, it is proposed that the Regional Conferences shall have full legislative power within their area and that this means that the Regional Conference has power to direct and control the educational enterprises and institutions and more, I foresee that in the exercise of the power thus proposed for the Regional Conferences irrepressible conflicts between the Regional Conferences which seem to have this power and the Annual Conferences which do possess it under charter will surely come. I understand that Mr. Simpson states what is well understood legally and that the charter is the governing instrument in those institutions, but I am equally sure, and experience bears me out in this, that it is quite possible to get a very acute controversy and dispute over the interpretation of charter rights in an educational institution, and it is quite possible for the Regional Conferences to assume direction or control of an educational institution which has a specific charter that will bring it in conflict with the Annual Conference operating under the terms of that charter. No matter what the terms of the charter are, for example, reading back into these records what is here, that we have this suggestion directing and controlling, and I will say it was clear that the intention was to give the Regional Conference legislative power in the direction and control of these institutions and that the Regional Conference, being the larger, supersedes the Annual Conference in the exercise of its normal charter rights. I know what would be right in the case. We all know what would be right. The charter rights would obtain. The Annual Conference would have the right under its charter, but we also know that a conflict would be inevitable, for some Regional Conference under this blanket provision with those words would assume to do this thing.

David G. Downey: I am very glad that Bishop Cranston has made my speech on that part of the amendment. Now, I wish to speak on the other part of the amendment, which I desire Brother Chappell to read.

E. B. Chappell: What we are on now is putting "area" instead of "jurisdiction."

David G. Downey: I want the other part read.

E. B. Chappell: Add after the word same in the third line from the bottom of the paragraph "and to establish, own, and control educational and benevolent institutions."

David G. Downey: That amendment makes it possible for the

Regional Conferences to own, operate, and control educational institutions within its boundary.

E. B. Chappell: Not all of them.

David G. Downey: Those it pleases.

E. B. Chappell: Those it establishes and owns.

David G. Downey: That was made especially with reference to the remarks of Dr. Lamar. These are two institutions, I think, theological in part, if not entirely.

A. J. Lamar: No; they are universities.

David G. Downey: They have theological departments?

A. J. Lamar: Yes.

David G. Downey: Dr. Lamar said he could not consent to have them transferred to the unified Church. That would look as if there was a purpose.

A. J. Lamar: "To the General Conference of the unified Church," I said.

David G. Downey: Yes, the General Conference of the unified Church. Does that mean that we are not willing to put all our institutions that are now under the control of our respective General Conferences under the control of the one General Conference?

A. J. Lamar: Shall I answer that?

David G. Downey: Yes.

A. J. Lamar: You force me to be exceedingly frank in making a statement which I did not wish to make on account of the presence of two members of this Commission. The thing I had in view was simply this: These institutions are in the heart of the South, and they are white institutions. They do not admit colored students and never will. That was the difficulty I had in mind.

David G. Downey: It is well for all of these matters to come out in a perfectly frank and brotherly way. We might as well understand where we are at the beginning as at the close. We have institutions under the control of our General Conference. We have theological institutions. I have no thought but when we have a unified Church and one General Conference that those institutions will naturally pass under the General Conference of the unified Church and will belong to the whole Church.

A. J. Lamar: The two institutions of which I speak?

David G. Downey: No; ours. Of course they have their charters, but we would not think of changing them and putting them under the control of the Regional Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon: What university is under the control of your General Conference?

Bishop McDowell: Our institutions are owned and controlled by a Board of Trustees, and some of them were specific as to

the relation of the General Conference connection for and on behalf of the whole Church.

P. D. Maddin: Will you pardon me? I believe Dr. Lamar's fear is without grounds. One institution is in Georgia and one in Texas, and under the laws of those States it is illegal, and it would be punishable by imprisonment to put white persons in a colored school or colored persons in a white school, and that will not change in the next fifty years, and I think Dr. Lamar's fear will never be realized.

David G. Downey: I hope nobody supposed I would think there would be any changes in this matter or any change in the matter of the control of these schools. But Dr. Lamar stated that the control of those schools now was in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and they could not afford to have the control of the Methodist Episcopal Church when unified.

A. J. Lamar: I did.

David G. Downey: That seems like a lack of confidence and trust that makes it nearly impossible to come together.

E. B. Chappell: I offered that resolution, and it seems that Dr. Downey's remarks are a reflection on my integrity.

David G. Downey: If they are, I will withdraw them. I didn't mean it that way.

E. B. Chappell: I would like to be permitted to explain for myself when you get through.

David G. Downey: I do not see how it is possible for us to get together unless we are perfectly willing to trust one another and not reserve institutions in one section that we are not reserving in the other. If the charter rights now inhere in one General Conference, why may they not inhere in the unified General Conference? Why may they not inhere in the Annual Conference, where they would naturally belong?

T. D. Samford: There may be a difference between being transferred to the unified Church and being transferred to the control of the General Conference of the unified Church.

David G. Downey: That might be.

T. D. Samford: Just as all the property of the Annual Conference will go to the unified Church and all the schools will go to the unified Church, but will be under the control of the Conference jurisdiction.

David G. Downey: I am opposed to the amendment, especially when we remember what was stated this morning by Dr. Hyer. Dr. Moore called out the statement by Dr. Hyer, and one statement of Dr. Hyer was that under his plan the duties and the powers of the Regional Conference would be very markedly electoral and administrative. Those were the precise terms he used. I think the attempt to put into them now full legislative

powers and include in full legislative powers everything that is included here is hardly the wise thing to do. We were hoping that we could get together on this plan that was brought in by the Subcommittee, and I believe that if we do not attempt to overload it we shall be able to do so. Personally I am heartily in favor of Section 4 as it came from the Committee. I would not object to the substitution of the word "area" for "jurisdiction," but I do hope we shall be able to arrange our educational institutions so that we will feel that we are all to be one and that wherever there is anything that pertains to the unified Church that it is the same in every part of our territory, and I believe that can be accomplished unless we attempt to load up this Section 4.

E. B. Chappell: I want to explain that I hardly think it is necessary, because I am sure that the brethren of this Commission could not have so greatly misunderstood me. In the first place, I never thought of the matter to which Brother Lamar refers. It never occurred to me in the remotest way. In the second place, I was not thinking of taking anything from the control of the General Conference. I was thinking of this: It had been questioned as to whether the Regional Conferences would have the right to own and control the institutions. I know the power of local sentiment and local patriotism, and I know very well that you could rally to the support of the given area around the school located in the center of it if it belonged to it in a way that you could not possibly do if it were a connectional institution in a larger sense; and I think without any doubt these Regional Conferences should have the right to establish, own, and control educational and benevolent institutions. If that is in here already, as a matter of course my amendment is not necessary; but that has been called in question, and certainly it would not hurt anything to grant such powers as that distinctly. It does not say anything about any particular institution anywhere; but it does give to any area that wants to the right to establish, own, and control educational or benevolent institutions or hospitals or deaconess's homes or anything of that kind. I think certainly these Regional Conferences ought to have that power.

Bishop Denny: I rise to inquire whether the words or the clause that Dr. Chappell suggested as an amendment are before us together or whether we are now considering the substitution of "area" for "jurisdiction."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): It was suggested that we consider them separately.

E. B. Chappell: I withdraw the other part, and we will take up the matter about the area.

Bishop Denny: I move the previous question on the amendment with reference to the area.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I would like to answer Bishop McDowell. Bishop McDowell seems to be confused about what we mean and says if we mean anything to put that something in. We do mean area or territory right there, and why shall not we say so instead of leaving in a word that is capable of two meanings to give us trouble in the future? I do not think we should do such a thing as that. If we do not mean area, let us say so; but if we mean area, let us say so, and we won't get into any trouble. I think we should make this as simple as it can be made.

E. C. Reeves: I want to make a statement about that lest some one may be misled. I want to join my brother on the right. The question raised by Dr. Lamar has no force. The holding will be under the law of the State as it is, and the color question cannot enter into it. The Church cannot affect the State laws, and nobody need be troubled by that. We have nothing in the world to do with it. If our Southern States were to change the laws on that subject, there might be some difference, but that will never be done while I live or while my children live, and I am not interested further than that.

Bishop McDowell: I want to say, first of all, that I am obliged to Brother Simpson for his illuminating clarification of my illegal mind. I never pretended to have a legal mind in these matters; but if it is proposed to say that the Regional Conferences shall have full legislative powers over all distinctly legal affairs within its area, including the power to fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences or the Mission Conferences within the area, this should be added.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Those are necessarily implied.

Bishop McDowell: It would be better for it to be clear. If the meaning of that first sentence, in view of the statement made this morning both by Dr. Hyer and Mr. Maddin, is as it was originally defined, then I am opposed to this amendment, for distinctly at the end of the forenoon we went out with the view of giving legislative powers to the Regional Conferences and thought we had reached a happy solution of the difficulties that confronted us and the perplexities that have befallen us. If the legislative power is to remain within the area, then I am distinctly opposed to the proposition before us, for it is not in accordance with the terms of the resolution recommitting the matter when we adjourned this forenoon. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that I know this whole Commission smiled over what they thought was my legal blunder, the truth is, the Regional Conference must have legislative power over the local matters that are within its jurisdiction, within the area, and to give the Annual Conference powers of a legislative sort is laying up for the Church conflicts of authority between jurisdictional Conferences and Annual Conferences that will return to plague many

institutions from coast to coast if you pass this matter with this understanding. I distinctly oppose the matter with the understanding that has now been interpolated into it.

Bishop Denny: There is evidently, from what Bishop McDowell says, a total misapprehension on the part of some of us. I had no understanding this morning when this report was re-committed to the Committee on Conferences that there was to be an excision of any powers that had been granted to the Regional Conferences; but when I went into the Committee I found that a blanket provision had been made instead of a list of specifications brought out, and I turned and asked—I suppose Bishop McDowell could not have heard it, from what he says—but I turned and asked—

Bishop McDowell: I was not present when that happened.

Bishop Denny: I asked why the change was made and was told by some of the brethren there—I do not recall by whom, but it was said in the presence of the Committee—that this was for the purpose of ridding papers of what was superfluous if we gave the blanket power, which, of course, I understood. Now, I could not for a moment consent to diminution of the legislative powers of the Regional Conferences, for that belongs to the essence of the thing for which we contend. We are here to see that what is dear to us, the right of local self-government in this matter, is contended for. We do not want to control anybody else; but, as far as we are able to manage it, we do not propose that anybody else shall control us; and if there be anybody who proposes to control us, we should like to know that in ample time to prepare for it. These Regional Conferences, shorn down to an electoral party, will become what electors are in presidential elections in very little time—that is, they will be nothing in the world but the hand of the voters; and while that was pronounced to be the strongest and greatest feat of the Constitution, as can be seen by anybody who reads it, we know how that constitutional expectation has turned out. We must stand and stand solidly and stand understandingly for legislative powers in these Regional Conferences and leave to the Regional Conferences a right to say, under the Constitution that shall be adopted and under the power of the General Conference that shall have control over connectional matters; but it must be clearly understood that within that jurisdiction that is distinctly local the locality controls and legislates. If that cannot be understood, it should be clearly brought out, so that we can look each other in the face and vote. I am heartily in favor of it and hope this motion will pass, because it clears up that one point.

J. F. Goucher: We are suffering a little from an attack of after-ten-o'clockness. We have had a very long and tiresome day. The nervous poise of some is hardly normal. We are not

seeing as clearly or expressing ourselves with as much discrimination as we did this morning or this afternoon. The position taken by Bishop Denny is this, I think, a position which underlies this whole matter of Regional Conferences. It was my privilege to be at the General Conference at Saratoga, a member of the Committee of Sixty which prepared the report, and to present the report on unification to the General Conference; and the argument used in presenting the report was that we should have a large number of Regional Conferences in order that there might be greater homogeneity in the regional areas, thereby making possible local legislation better adapted to the necessities of the case. That was the prime, fundamental, underlying principle of that request; and I believe in it because, as I understand the situation, this will make for increased efficiency. The tendency of development is always from the individualistic to the communistic. The cell divides, subdivides, and continues to divide, building up the individual factors for the higher organization with a steady trend toward coördinating and subordinating them to the larger functions of the communistic relation. The development of Methodism is no exception. The justification of Methodism is its adjustment and ability to advance the kingdom of Christ. In an early stage of Methodism it sought efficiency through differentiation. Some principle of action became embodied in an organization. In 1828, the emphasis of the principle that laymen are an essential and integral part of the Church and should participate actively and officially in the councils of the Church resulted in the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. In 1844 the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, went off primarily that it might adjust its ministries to conditions largely dominant in its environment.

Bishop Denny: That verb "went off"—went off from what?

J. F. Goucher: It is hardly necessary for me to explain these words. It is impossible for any one to differ from another more than that other differs from him. The distance they are apart is exactly the same. To clearly recognize the implications of this fact that they separated simplifies the problem. We need not follow in detail the principles underlying differentiation and embodied in each of the score of branches of American Methodism. Not one of them has embodied a schism or a question of doctrine. All have kept the faith in the unity of the spirit. Each differentiated itself as a method of procedure with the fundamental purpose of securing such interpretation as would make for increased efficiency. These were a part of the individualistic development. American Methodism is entering upon, and we are planning for, its communistic development. In the development of the higher functions of life we always come to the communistic condition. It is based upon efficiency by co-

ordination. That for which the Methodist Protestant Church differentiated itself has come to be recognized to the extent that all other branches of Methodism have recognized the principle and include laymen in its legislative councils. The same thing has transpired with regard to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It has manifested efficiency through differentiation, made possible by adjustment to environment. We have come to the point where we desire to have Regional Conferences so constituted that, applying this principle, they may adjust themselves in their administration, not in doctrine, but in their driving force, their dynamic, their closer adjustment to their relations. Hence we suggested an enlarged number of Regional Conferences that there might be more accurate adjustment to environment. If I am correct in this, it is essential for the largest efficiency and thorough coördination that we should provide for adjustment to environment and commit to the Regional Conferences full authority to legislate in all their local matters. I see no difficulty in this passage between Dr. Downey, Dr. Chappell, Dr. Lamar, and others. There is a necessity which requires every institution to work under its charter. An institution may be under the control of an Annual Conference; it may be under the control of two or more Annual Conferences; it may be under the control of the whole Church or of the Regional Conferences. A charter may be so adjusted that the government may be located in any of these. It may be controlled in any of these ways or in many others. There is not much difference in this particular between many institutions north of the Mason and Dixon line from those in the Southland. They are held by trustees and administered for the Church of which they are a part and through whose zeal and generosity they came into existence. There is no difficulty here. It is simply necessary that they should conform to their charter requirements and have opportunity to adjust themselves to their environment. I believe thoroughly that the Regional Conference should have full authority, subject to the limitations of the General Conference, to legislate for all regional matters within its area. That does not mean that they should of necessity do this or that or the other if their charter or their local or their constitutional limitations prevent, but they should have the power where there are no such limitations. I think if we can place ourselves back by two or three hours in nervous poise, there is nothing here but that which falls as a shadow from the hours of continuous mental application. I am heartily in favor of the amendment.

Edwin M. Randall: I do not know but that there is considerable in the clarifying address we have just had from Dr. Goucher. It was meat and drink for my mind after ten o'clock at night, and I am not sure but that we had better propose to take this mat-

er up in the morning than to try to get through with it at this late hour. I do not believe we are ready to vote.

Bishop Denny: Don't you think we are ready to vote on the question of area?

Edwin M. Randall: I do not believe that we are ready to vote on area with all that it involves; for I think the settling of that word "area" involves a great deal, and I do not believe it would help if what we do at this time would be regarded as tentative, not only in this, but in other matters, because if we define the General Boards and their functions, and if we continue to have certain General Boards, we will be so related to the benevolent and educational institutions that we are likely to have them conflict with any such powers that we are proposing to give these Regional Conferences; and I wish to say, furthermore, as the discussion has developed, and particularly if the interpretation which Dr. Blake gives to this section under discussion is to stand, and if in the future in working out the plan of what we are adopting this whole list is to be taken up and used in the interpretation of this passage and understanding that that does not comprehend it all, I apprehend that, as far as the consideration of this matter in the area with which I am associated is concerned, this new report makes it more rather than less difficult. I am satisfied that if these people had asked of Brother Watt or myself or Brother Neff an explanation of what this passage means and we used that only and gave them to understand that it is but a part of what is signified in the functions of this body we are creating as a Regional Conference, they will apprehend that with us in our vast territory and widely separated population, the institutions remotely separated from each other with no relation to each other at all—I believe the thing will seem formidable and difficult and ominous to them. It may seem clearer to-morrow morning, and I believe it would be well not to settle this thing until we think over it.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that we adjourn.

Rolla V. Watt: I would like for you to withhold that. I have to go away to-morrow.

Bishop Mouzon: I will withhold the motion.

Rolla V. Watt: When one of the gentlemen said yesterday that he would take only a moment, a gentleman near me said: "That means a long speech." But I am really only going to take a moment. I am not going to make a long speech. When Dr. Goucher sprung that speech of his about the Regional Conference duties and the coördination, etc., I felt very depressed about this. When I came into the room I was quite ready to vote for it; but if you will hark back to what Dr. Goucher said about requiring a division of these Regional Conferences and remember that you have about fifteen States in the Fifth Regional Conference and

that four-fifths of the population of that section is east of the Rocky Mountains and practically know nothing about the requirements of the Pacific Coast, you will readily see we are going to be put in a bad position if these Regional Conferences are to be legislative bodies, and we shall have no voice in the matters which most definitely control. We are put in that great bunch because they have no close population and membership, but that is no reason why the Pacific Coast States would be willing to be swallowed up wholly by the great States of the Middle West and have those people in Iowa and Nebraska and Wisconsin and along the Mississippi River determine our problems west of the Rocky Mountains. If you will look at that little map that Dr. Spencer has made here, showing where these various regions touch each other, you will see the defects of this scheme that is proposed.

T. D. Samford: Could not those States determine your problems as well as New York and New Jersey?

Rolla V. Watt: No, sir; they don't know the lines between each other.

T. D. Samford: But don't they know as much about it as New York and New Jersey?

Rolla V. Watt: They are not in our region.

T. D. Samford: But they would be in the General Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: I now renew my motion that we adjourn.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried, and the Joint Commission was dismissed with benediction by Dr. Nast, as follows: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be and abide with us all. Amen."

FOURTH DAY, JUNE 30, 1917.

The Joint Commission was called to order by Bishop Candler, Chairman.

The hymn "Come, Thou Fount of Every Blessing" was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Downey will lead us in prayer.

David G. Downey: Reverently, O Lord God, thou who art our Father, we come into thy presence. We realize our weakness, and we know our need of wisdom and of grace. In simplicity and with all humility we bow before thee and wait for the gracious touch of thy Holy Spirit to be upon us. Help us this day and every day to think and speak and act as in thy presence. We remind ourselves that thou art not only our Father, but the Father of all men everywhere and in every conceivable condition. We make our prayer unto thee for universal light for all the nations that are drenched in blood and that are enduring the awful horrors of a savage war. We un-

derstand how closely we are involved in it, and we make our prayer to thee that speedily the time may come when there shall be peace with righteousness and when all the wickedness and woe of war shall be done away with and men shall be glad to live together as children of one Father. Bless our nation, we pray thee, in these difficult and trying times. Upon thy servant, the President of the United States, pour out thy spirit and give him the needed wisdom and strength, and to all his counsellors wilt thou give wisdom and enrich them with thine own plans and purposes. Bless the men who at the call have responded and come to the colors. Bless those who are in the field in France and in the training camps and those who will be there. We know not what the future has in store; but we pray, O Lord, that we may have confidence in the overruling wisdom that can understand and see where we do not understand. Help us not to lose our faith in God; help us not to lose our faith in our fellow men. God, bless us gathered about this council table. We have high tasks, and we have difficult problems; but the tasks are not too high for thee nor are the problems too difficult for thy divine solution. We ask, O Lord, that somehow, in a way that we do not see now, thou wilt so illumine our minds and touch our hearts and so guide our judgment as that not what we would but what God would shall somehow come to pass. Continue with us in the spirit of brotherhood, let mutual love and kindness prevail, and may the Spirit of God continue to be with us in our deliberations and bring us, we pray thee, in thine own good time to our destined end, the heaven here and hereafter.

All united in saying the Lord's Prayer.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) read the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John.

All then united in singing the hymn "Come, Ye That Love the Lord."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Young will lead us in prayer.

W. J. Young: Our Father, we rejoice to-day in the consciousness that comes to us in the assurance that we are thy children and thou our Father. We feel in this that we are rich, whatever else we may or may not have. We come to-day to ask thee that thou wilt give us a deeper conviction and a dearer and sweeter realization of this truth than we have ever had before. We never weary of having thee tell us again and again of thy love for us, of having the assurance that we are saved by faith in Jesus Christ and that thou art and wilt be continually with us throughout the journey of life and that we are to live forever in closer and sweeter fellowship in the better world. O wilt thou this moment as we bow ourselves in prayer speak again to us this precious word, and let thy Spirit, once more sent into our hearts,

lead us to cry out in any formal way, but in exultance, the profoundest realization of the truth that thou art our Father. And we pray thee that we may undertake our task with this before us; and whatever may be our problems, we pray thee that this truth may never be absent from our minds and this experience never be forgotten. As thy children may we be imitators of thee, and may we be imitators of thine own dear Son. We pray thee that thou wilt give us the broad vision thou hast of the atoning work of Jesus Christ, of the great world needs, of the vast opportunities lying at our feet, and of the wonderful kingdom which thou art building and which in spite of men shall be completed one great day. May we have, therefore, no narrow speaking to-day. May we have no narrow visions. O God, forbid that we should so fix our attention upon the smaller things that we shall be unable to see as thou seest and to think as thou thinkest. O help us to think our thoughts of thee, to bring into captivity every thought in obedience to Christ and in harmony with the great scheme he had on earth and in obedience to thy wonderful purposes during the ages. Help us to see only the things that are in harmony with our relationship in this blessed truth one with the other. May we be brothers, not in any ordinary sense, but may we be brothers because we are the children of one Father and because on us is thy divine hand! We pray thee that during all these precious moments to-day thou wilt give us the vision of the cross of Jesus. May we remember that we are, after all, not so much out of the shadow of the orders and directions and history and purposes of our individual Churches as we are sitting in the presence of him who loved us and gave himself for us. May we look into his face and may we hear his prayer for us and for his Church through all the ages! May we be ashamed to do anything out of harmony with his desires and may we be ashamed not to do the things that are in harmony with his purposes and the things he came to do and which he left in our hands to complete! Forbid that the task should be unfinished still because we are unwilling to do our part in the completion of it. We pray thee, our Father, that we may be conscious of the presence of thy Spirit as we sit here. May this morning be to us a new Pentecost! May this morning be to us as an upper chamber and may the Spirit abide with us! May we speak with other tongues to-day as the Spirit shall give us utterance! And so we pray that all things may be done in harmony with thy will, that in some way or another the task before us may be completed or so carried forward that thou shalt be glorified and our own hearts rejoice in the sweet confidence that thou shalt give us thine approval for having done thy will. We ask this for the Redeemer's sake. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Secretary will read the minutes.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

C. M. Bishop : I would like first to make an inquiry as to the rules under which we are operating. Are the rules concerning the length of speeches and the number of speeches allowed to each member adopted in Baltimore supposed to be in operation here? I have heard it intimated that they were, and then I have heard it disputed. Can anybody answer that?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : They are.

C. M. Bishop : I would like to understand that.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : In other words, you would like to see them enforced?

C. M. Bishop : Yes. Now, taking up Section 4, I wish to offer an amendment. Leading up to the amendment, it seems to me worth while to mention the fact that the proposed assignment of powers to the Regional Conferences seems in some minds to suggest that the Regional Conferences will take over the power now belonging to the Annual Conferences. It seems to me that was the point of several addresses made last evening. But I don't think that can be contemplated by any one or that that is the purpose of this section. However, it ought to be guarded, and the amendment which I wish to offer as a substitute for the amendment of Dr. Chappell, to the latter part of the amendment of Dr. Chappell—

E. B. Chappell : That has been withdrawn for the present.

C. M. Bishop : What is the matter before us?

E. B. Chappell : On changing "jurisdiction" to "area."

Bishop McDowell : That was what we had in mind.

C. M. Bishop : Part of what I had too; but I wished to offer an amendment to the latter part of the amendment offered by Dr. Chappell, which it seems has been withdrawn.

E. B. Chappell : But only temporarily.

Bishop McDowell : Read your amendment.

C. M. Bishop : The amendment I wish to offer instead of the latter part of Dr. Chappell's amendment is to add to the first paragraph of Section 4 another paragraph which will read as follows: "It shall also have power to receive, own, transfer, and control educational, benevolent, and charitable institutions of the Church within its own territory which are not otherwise legally provided for and shall have supervision of all such enterprises except those that are under control or supervised by some other organic agency of the Church." It seems to me that that will entirely leave out of the power now possibly granted to the Regional Conference the supervision and control of all those enterprises which now belong to the Annual Conferences, which is a thing I believe we all desire. We do not wish to accomplish

anything more by this article than to secure for the Regional Conferences control of those local matters which heretofore have been within the power of the General Conference and which may be more satisfactorily cared for by the Regional Conferences. We had wished to take some of the burden off the General Conference. It is not proposed that that large Western region which has been suggested to us as offering such difficulties, it is not proposed in the case of the Annual Conference enterprises there that the entire Regional Conference shall take over those concerns and be required to give constant attention to them and be responsible for their management. All of us would protest against that. I think this matter bears upon the question also raised by Dr. Lamar last night as to the two educational institutions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There are doubtless many educational institutions in both Churches which those interested in them would not wish to turn over to the General Conference's control. I happen to be president of a college which belongs to six Annual Conferences, and it is controlled by them. There would be the strongest objection to making that college the property and subject to the control of the General Conference so that by a vote of the General Conference some order might be given concerning it quite contrary to the plan of those who founded it and have maintained it during all the years. I think that was the situation concerning the schools to which Dr. Lamar referred. I should not be willing to say that those schools should now be made the property of the General Conference of the United Church. Let them be deeded to the United Church, but let them be subject to the Annual Conference control or the control of a group of Annual Conferences or the control of a Regional Conference just as most of our other institutions will be. I really think that this clears up the whole matter of the difficulties that were brought before us last night. We were arguing two questions, one group of men in one view of it and another group in another view of it. I don't think—at any rate, I don't know of any man in the Southern delegation who wishes to take away from the Annual Conference or group of Annual Conferences the right they now have to control educational, benevolent, and charitable organizations, and I think this paragraph which I offer will guard that particular point.

Bishop Cooke: I most heartily agree with the sentiment expressed by Dr. Bishop. I think he is leading distinctly in the right direction. I think it harmonizes with the thoughts of some of us who made objections to the specific statements made as to the power of the Regional Conferences over the Annual Conferences. But there are some words in the amendment which might still need further controversy; and therefore, in order to reach

some end and to leave out some of these things, I offer as a substitute—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I think there are two amendments already.

E. B. Chappell : And the brother is speaking to a matter not before the house. The matter before the house is changing "jurisdiction" to "area."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Chair would like to be officially informed as to the parliamentary situation.

Secretary Thomas : The only direct question before the house is the first amendment of Dr. Chappell. That is all that is before the house.

Bishop Cooke : To come directly to the main point—namely, the area—in order to avoid all disputes and all quibble or misinterpretation concerning "area" and jurisdiction," I think the best way to do would be to get rid of it altogether; and therefore I would substitute for "area" and "jurisdiction" "affairs." I would say "power over all distinctly regional affairs, to establish and maintain educational and other institutions, to fix the powers, boundaries," etc. I offer that as a substitute.

Bishop McDowell : I rise on a question of personal privilege which is involved in my Chairmanship of this Commission. Last night it appeared that I was not in proper relation to the Committee itself. It was wholly through a misunderstanding which I wish to explain to the Joint Commission. Yesterday morning, when we were discussing Regional Conferences, Brother Maddin made a most luminous statement of very great value. Later, under invitation from Dr. Moore, Dr. Hyer made a still further statement of very great value. These two statements, together with the debate they provoked, led me to say what I did say yesterday as to the gratification I had as to the practical light that was thrown upon the obscure problem of Regional Conferences by their contributions to it. What I said yesterday morning I stand by this morning. I said it then with all sincerity and repeat it now with all sincerity. I was grateful then and am grateful now. At the end of the forenoon all the suggestions that had been made in the way of amendments on motion were recommitted to the Committee on Conferences with the suggestion that Mr. Maddin should be associated with the Committee for the consideration of these matters. In the course of Mr. Hyer's statement he said, as the stenographer reports to me: "The suggestion I have made to several is along this line, that we should retain, as in this report, these distinct and separate areas not, however, for legislative purposes, but for administrative and electoral purposes." That language was not my language and never was; but, interpreting the purpose for which the matter was recommitted in the light of both Brother Mad-

din's admirable statement and Dr. Hyer's clear and illuminating statement, our Committee took this matter back to a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Chappell, Mr. Hyer, Mr. Simpson, and Dr. Blake. To them was committed the business of rewriting in the light of this discussion the motion and all that had transpired. I asked Mr. Maddin to be associated with that Committee for that purpose. In the late afternoon, when we were considering the subcommittee's report, there came in the statement which Dr. Blake as Secretary read last night. I did not happen to hear it. I don't think I could have been present at the moment when the conversation passed in the Committee to which Dr. Blake afterwards referred in saying that this blanket provision conferred the same powers and more upon the Regional Conferences. Now, Mr. Chairman, I distinctly understood that the purpose in referring the matter back to us was for the simplification of this matter and in all good faith supposed and believed that the report that was presented here expressed that purpose. So as Chairman of the Committee I was endeavoring to do my duty to secure the adoption of what was before us here. If for one moment I had imagined that the conversation which was read last night meant that all the powers that had previously been enumerated and more powers still of a legislative sort were contemplated in the new edition, I would have said: "This is in direct contradiction of my understanding of the atmosphere and purpose in which and for which the business was recommitted to us this morning, and instead of taking the place as Chairman of the Committee I would have asked some other person to act as Chairman of the Committee for the purpose of putting it through the body; for it would not have been proper ethics for me, differing wholly with the report at that point, to be in charge of the report. I make this statement for the purpose of clearing what may have seemed to some of you a very confused or embarrassing situation last night. However sad that may be, I will add that I thoroughly approve the statement made by the report of the Committee if it can be clarified. I think a clarification is necessary in view of what has been said. I would give the Regional Conference full legislative authority over matters distinctly regional in character. I would add a protective clause in the spirit of Dr. Bishop's suggestion that would make clear the charter rights of institutions controlled by Annual Conference or otherwise within a given region, so that no charter rights now existing should be disturbed or made doubtful. I want to thank the Chair and the house for permitting me to make this personal statement which I felt you were entitled to have. I stand exactly where I stood yesterday morning and where I thought the report of the Committee was standing.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, I want to have the

Secretary read the record, so that every one may have in mind the bearing of this present motion.

Secretary Thomas: It is Dr. Chappell's motion, seconded by Dr. Goucher, to substitute the word "area" instead of "jurisdiction." Then Bishop Cooke moved to amend—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Last night or now?

Secretary Thomas: Now.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I want last night's.

Secretary Harris: That is all that is before us now.

Secretary Harris: It was moved by Dr. Chappell that the word "area" be inserted instead of "jurisdiction" and after the word "same" insert "under control of educational and benevolent institutions." Discussion followed, and then, with the consent of his second, Dr. Chappell withdrew the second clause of his amendment so that the matter left before the house was to substitute the word "area" for the words "its jurisdiction."

E. B. Chappell: I think the Secretary is mistaken.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are you satisfied with the record?

E. B. Chappell: No, sir.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The minutes have been read and approved.

E. B. Chappell: I didn't hear them. I did not change the "its." I left the "its" there—"its area."

Secretary Thomas: The record has "its area."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): "Its" is there, then?

E. B. Chappell: No; I want the words "the area" to be substituted for "its jurisdiction."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Wasn't there an amendment by Dr. Bishop?

Secretary Thomas: Dr. Bishop's amendment was not seconded and only read by permission of the house, and this is proposed as an amendment to Dr. Bishop's amendment, which is not before the house.

Bishop Cooke: I think that is right.

Bishop Denny: Do you say there is no motion before the house?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Yes; there is a motion before the house, the amendment of Dr. Chappell.

Bishop Cooke: As a matter of privilege I desire to say, and really, after all, it is not a matter of privilege, because it is involved in the other matter. In eliminating the word "jurisdiction" in my amendment my reference was to Dr. Chappell's amendment. Dr. Chappell wanted the word "area"; and in order to get rid, as I stated in my previous discussion concerning the area and jurisdiction which was raised by Dr. Chappell's amendment, I put it "regional affairs." While it is true the first part

326 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

of my amendment related to Dr. Bishop's amendment, the real purpose was to eliminate "area" and "jurisdiction" in Dr. Chappell's motion, and I, therefore, think my amendment is before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Chair did recognize your address and amendment at the time; and although it may have been a little out of form, I presume you have a right to claim it is before the house.

Rolla V. Watt: With all due respect to all the gentlemen, it seems to me that the change of a word or two in this would make it unnecessary for Dr. Chappell's amendment or Dr. Cooke's or Dr. Bishop's. The difficulty last night was not only the late hours, but we got mixed up on these local institutions, and after I got back to the hotel I suggested to one or two gentlemen the substitution of this word "regional," and I want to offer this as a substitute for Dr. Chappell's amendment: Change the word "distinctively" to "distinctly" and drop out the words "within the jurisdiction" and insert the word "regional" for "local," so that it will read: "Subject to the limitation and restriction of this constitution, each Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctly regional affairs, including the power to fix the boundaries of Annual Conferences," etc. It seems to me that those words "distinctly regional affairs" will give all that is wanted. I offer that as a substitute or as an amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : For everything before the house?

Rolla V. Watt: Judge Simpson suggests it will not hurt anything to leave in these words "its area," so that I will make my substitute read "distinctly regional affairs within its area."

A vote being taken, the substitution of Mr. Watt was agreed to, and, a further vote being taken, the section as thus amended was adopted.

Rolla V. Watt: There is one other amendment which I think will help this resolution. The last clause of the report of the Committee is negative. It says: "No Regional Conference shall make rules or regulations not contrary to or in conflict with," etc. It seems to me it would be better to put that this way: "Regional Conferences may in the exercise of the power provided herein make rules or regulations not contrary to or in conflict with," etc. Maybe I am mistaken. It makes it positive instead of negative, however, that the Regional Conferences may make rules not in conflict with.

Edgar Blake: In the copy there were two words that should be left off.

Alexander Simpson, Jr. : I second the amendment just offered.

Rolla V. Watt: I will put it this way: "Regional Conferences

may, in the exercise of the power provided herein, make rules or regulations not contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I suggest that it be "each Regional Conference may," etc.

C. M. Bishop: I want to raise the question as to my own rights in the presentation of my amendment. We are passing the final paragraph of Section 4, but I don't think the first section has been adopted, and before we get to the final section I would like to offer my amendment.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I will second your amendment, but wait until we get through on this.

C. M. Bishop: I am willing if I have my rights.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brother Watt will read his amendment now.

Rolla V. Watt (reading): "Each Regional Conference may, in the exercise of the powers provided herein, make rules or regulations not contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control," etc.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

C. M. Bishop: Now, I offer the amendment which was read for information a few moments ago to follow the first paragraph of Section 4: "It shall also have power to receive, own, transfer, and control educational, benevolent, and charitable institutions of the Church within its own territory which are not otherwise legally provided for, and shall have supervision of all such enterprises except those which are owned, controlled, or supervised by some other organic agency of the Church." That may not be worded in the most fluent style, but you can all see the idea.

Bishop McDowell: It is correct in substance?

C. M. Bishop: I thank you. That is what I am concerned about. It seems to me we have not given the Regional Conferences the rights they ought to have. It ought to be possible for a Regional Conference to undertake the establishment of a hospital or a series of hospitals or other charitable institutions or educational institutions, and this will distinctly provide it may do that without interfering with the rights of the Annual Conferences or groups of Annual Conferences.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

W. N. Ainsworth: I wish to move another very small amendment. In the last part of the first division of Section 4 it reads: "Provided that no new Annual Conference shall be organized with less than 14,000 Church members in full connection therewith." I move that we amend that by inserting after the word

"organize" the words "in the United States." As it now reads this would stop the organization of an Annual Conference in the mission field when that territory has less than 14,000 Church members, and we certainly could not afford to leave ourselves bound in that way; so that I move to insert after the word "organize" the words "in the United States."

E. B. Chappell: I raise the question as to whether the organization in the mission areas is not provided for elsewhere. I think it is.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Clause 5 under the heading of General Conferences.

E. B. Chappell: "To define and fix the powers and duties of the Regional and Missionary Conferences, including their boundaries."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: As we are dealing in this section only with Conferences within the jurisdiction of certain Regional Conferences the words "in the United States" are necessarily implied; but it will tend, I think, to clarify things, because people will not have to reason in regard to it, if the words suggested by Dr. Ainsworth are put in. Therefore I take pleasure in seconding the amendment.

Bishop Cooke: I think that is really necessary. I do not think they are necessarily implied. The Hawaiian Mission and the Alaskan Mission are not within the boundaries of the United States, and so other Missions, and therefore it really is necessary that we should put in the words here, since we are giving the power to the Regional Conferences, because, as Brother Simpson has told me, what is not included is excluded as matter of law.

Bishop Denny: I rise to ask a question in light of the statement made by Bishop Cooke. I do not know the purport of the last decision of the Supreme Court of the United States as to the Hawaiians especially, but in order to reach the point that Bishop Cooke had in mind I think it might be necessary to say "continental United States."

W. N. Ainsworth: I recognize the difficulty at that point, since it is generally construed that Alaska and Hawaii are in the United States, and we would wish to except territory like that from this provision, and I shall not object to the language being "continental United States."

Bishop Mouzon: There is another matter which should be kept in mind right here. I am quite sure that 14,000 is too large a figure. It is certainly too large a figure. I should like to inquire how many members are in the Methodist Episcopal Church in New Mexico?

Edgar Blake: Six thousand.

Bishop Mouzon: Then it would not be possible to organize a Conference in New Mexico.

Bishop McDowell: This says: "No new Conference shall be organized."

Bishop Mouzon: We would have to organize a new one. I see the point of what is said, but the figures are too high. There are vast territories in the West and in the Northwest where it would be impossible to have an Annual Conference of less than 14,000. I suggest, while I am quite sure that you are moving on right lines when you are considering the Church membership rather than the number of preachers in the Annual Conference, at the same time, on account of those vast spaces out there, it might be better to say that no Annual Conference shall be organized with less than twenty-five preachers in full connection, and that would provide for your Conference out there in territory largely mission, but that is not mission.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We cannot take that up until Dr. Ainsworth's amendment is acted upon. If you confine this to continental United States, you have one proposition, and if you do not, you have an entirely different proposition.

A. J. Lamar: I do not think Dr. Ainsworth's amendment is exactly clear, because that includes Alaska and leaves out Hawaii and the Philippines.

W. N. Ainsworth: That is a question of interpretation. I would not think that Alaska would be a part of continental United States. It is not a part of the contiguous territory that makes out these United States. But that is purely a question upon which there may be a difference of opinion.

C. B. Spencer: I have run over the membership of the Annual Conferences since this motion was introduced by Dr. Ainsworth, and I find a large number have less than 14,000.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: If the Doctor will excuse me, I want to straighten this matter out. I would suggest to Dr. Ainsworth that instead of the words "continental United States" he use the words "States of the United States."

C. B. Spencer: I fear that I am introducing my remarks at the wrong point. If the question before the body is the definition of the words "continental United States," I do not care to speak, but I do wish to speak on the question of the 14,000.

W. N. Ainsworth: That is a question of phraseology, but I will accept the suggestion and use the words "States of the United States" instead of "continental United States."

John F. Goucher: I would like to raise a question. If Statehood is granted Alaska, would that change the matter?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: No, sir; it is not carried into the future. It is determined by the status existing at the time of its adoption.

Edgar Blake: The only territory affected by this motion is Hawaii. We are dealing with the powers of Regional Confer-

ences, not Missionary Conferences; and the Regional Conferences embrace only territory within the States of the United States except Alaska and Hawaii. Personally it seems to me we are quite safe in saying that the Regional Conferences shall not organize any Annual Conferences with less than 14,000, if 14,000 is the number that you want to fix it at, and then, when Hawaii comes up to the standard fixed by the Constitution, let them be recognized as an Annual Conference. Now, the facts of the case are that we have fifty-four Regional Conferences now in both Churches that have a membership of less than 15,000, and now the question is, Do we want to multiply small Conferences?

Rolla V. Watt: Are Hawaii and Alaska included in the same Conference as Porto Rico is?

Edgar Blake: No. The reason for that is this, in making up all the divisions of the Regional Missionary Conferences we followed the generally accepted plan and included in the first Eastern Asia, including China, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Malaysia; in the second, Southern Asia, including India and Burma; third, Europe, including Africa; fourth, Latin America, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America. It seems to me that Porto Rico really belongs to Mexico and South America.

Bishop Hamilton: I introduced this whole business, and I think Brother Mouzon has hit upon a plan that will obviate the difficulty. It is not a difficulty in the creation of new Conferences, but it is introducing discrimination between existing Conferences, because we have Conferences that do not have any such number of members, and there is a reason why we should not confine it to members. The Methodist Episcopal Church has determined this matter by membership and ministers, and that is the only fair way to come at this matter. It may be because of the very remote distances and the ocean between that it is necessary for us to be directed by the ministers rather than by the members, because it may be just as necessary to look after five thousand members as it is to look after 15,000 members; and if you can limit the number of ministers sufficiently that come into the Annual Conference, then you avoid the matter of discrimination. I don't think it is possible to reach this matter by defining continental United States, because you will find Conferences continually being created in the new territory and in foreign countries, and I think if you direct that it shall be based upon ministers instead of so many members we can reach an adjustment.

Bishop Mouzon: I did not make a motion, and if you will permit me to add a word just here, If I had seen the word "new" in here, I would not have said a word. I thought it said

[Redacted]

no Annual Conference shall be organized, but it said no new Annual Conference. Therefore I take back what I said.

J. W. Van Cleve: I think the matter of organizing new Conferences—

Rolla V. Watt: I raise the question of order. The question is not the requirement of new Conferences, but the question is whether we are going to amend by adding the words "States of the United States."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Bishop Hamilton has made no motion.

Rolla V. Watt: He was speaking on the other branch of the matter.

J. W. Van Cleve: There is a very intimate relation between the two things. The number of members required to form a new Conference might have something to do with the ministers to be assigned at the new Conference. I think that they are so related that they must in a sense be considered together. If you say 5,000, we don't care where you put it; but when you put it at 14,000, that is a different matter. If the other motion is put, I am quite willing for it to be acted upon.

H. M. Du Bose: This amendment more probably should be "continental United States, not including Alaska."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Dr. Ainsworth has accepted it "in the States of the United States."

H. M. Du Bose: But if Alaska gets in as a State, there would still be difficulty.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Edwin M. Randall: I would like to raise a question here in regard to the application of that. There confronts us the necessity under this provision—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Supreme Court has not yet been constituted. This is not the time for interpretation.

Edwin M. Randall: I was not asking for an interpretation, but asking for a question relating to the matter with which we are dealing.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Well, everything has been voted on.

Edwin M. Randall: Then, to bring it before the body, I move that this paragraph be amended so that it will read: "No new Annual Conference shall be organized in the States of the United States with less than twenty-five preachers in full connection."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You mean to substitute that for the 14,000? Is there a second to that amendment?

The amendment was seconded by several.

F. M. Thomas: I move to substitute for that 10,000 members. I lived out in the West a number of years, and 14,000 is entirely too high for that section.

332 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Dr. Randall still has the floor.

E. B. Chappell : I second Dr. Thomas's motion, however.

Edwin M. Randall : I want to call attention to this, that in carrying out the consolidation it will be necessary for us to unite various Conferences now in existence, and they will necessarily become new Conferences.

Alexander Simpson, Jr. : They will not in law.

Edwin M. Randall : Do you say that the combining two existing Conferences is not making a new Conference?

Alexander Simpson, Jr. : No. A new Conference is a Conference newly arranged for. If you get married, you don't become a new Dr. Randall, though you ought to.

Edwin M. Randall : In view of that legal statement, I will withdraw my amendment.

F. M. Thomas : I move that the section be amended by striking out the words "fourteen thousand" and substituting the words "ten thousand," and my reason is this: In the reorganization of American Methodism it will be necessary to create new Annual Conferences sometimes out of fragments of Conferences, and it ought not to be a matter of the number of preachers, but the constituency involved. It is very easy for preachers to transfer out of a section and make the organization of Annual Conferences impossible if they desire to prevent the formation of an Annual Conference. There are sections out West where it might be necessary to gather together the fragments of Annual Conferences that have been left, and I think 10,000 would be a proper number to fix as a basis for this fusion.

W. N. Ainsworth : I wish to renew the amendment withdrawn by Dr. Randall. I offer it as a substitute for Dr. Thomas's motion—namely, that no new Annual Conference shall be organized in the States of the United States with less than twenty-five preachers in full connection. I need not add any remarks to this except that I heartily agree with the statement which Bishop Mouzon has made two or three different times—namely, that the historic basis for the organization of Annual Conferences in traveling history is given territory rather than Church membership. I therefore renew this motion as a substitute for Dr. Thomas's motion.

Bishop Candler : I appreciate the difficulty the brothers are seeking to evade; but I would like to draw attention to a matter that seems not to have been thought of, and we had better not get out of one difficulty and jump right into another. If you put this on the number of preachers, you have two bases for the Regional Conferences, one resting on preachers while the other rests on membership. I do not know what kind of distinction that would be. Then there is another thing to be said. I am not

proposing a remedy. I am simply showing it to you so that you can devise a remedy. If you get below the proposition in the other Conferences, you will give an instrument of power to the new that does not belong to the old, and you will have something like what we have in the Congress of the United States. Nevada, with a tremendous territory, had 102,000 inhabitants in 1915, and the votes of the two Senators from that State offset the two votes of the Senators from the State of New York, with its 8,000,000 people.

Henry Wade Rogers: If you take in Greater New York, we have a great many more than that.

Bishop Candler: And if you take in Greater Atlanta, we have 2,000,000. I was just simply referring to State lines. Of course there is no space between New York and Philadelphia. Now, there is a difficulty you meet if you change the spaces. You give a vastly enhanced value to one of these smaller Conferences.

Bishop Candler took the chair as Chairman.

Bishop Cranston: I have called Bishop Candler to the chair because I feel that I should say just a word about the amendment which is before us, the amendment just passed. It seems that there has been quite a general sentiment in the Commission looking to the making of membership the basis of representation rather than the number of ministers. It is now proposed that the Annual Conferences shall be organized on the old basis that prevailed in our Church.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): It has existed in both Churches.

Bishop Cranston: That where there are twenty-nine ministers it can be organized into an Annual Conference. I have presided in some of those Conferences when the incentive to become an Annual Conference was becoming very strong and when there was quite a willingness to have ministers transferred to them so as to get the Conference. There is a temptation that sometimes goes so far as to ask the transfer of a superannuated man to make the number. There is certainly no equity in allowing the representation that some of these small Conferences have. They give, as has been suggested, to a number of fifty individuals two Churches, and that is a number sufficient to change the course of legislation on matters in which they are not vitally concerned. I can conceive of a situation in the unfolding of the practical results of our present deliberations that might become very irritating. It is too easy for Conferences to multiply the number of preachers, and the temptation is too great with the ease with which the thing could be accomplished for Annual Conferences to increase their representation in the General Conference. I would not doubt on the other hand if you reduced the membership to ten thousand as a basis, the calculation last night being

334 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

taken as correct, you would come out of the General Conference increased by this going from 14,000 to 10,000.

Edgar Blake: No, it does not have that effect.

Bishop Cranston: Then I am mistaken.

Bishop McDowell: The ratio would remain at 14,000, but a new Conference might be organized at 10,000, and that would not change the ratio in the Conference already existing.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: No, but the new Conferences would get two representatives to the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: Yes.

Bishop Cranston: Why is not the arrangement satisfactory for the general welfare? It may not be so acceptable to the brethren in the smaller Conferences to remain a Mission Conference until they grow to larger proportions, but they have all the privileges except the direct representation in the General Conference and are allowed in the Mission Conference now to vote upon the election of delegates to the General Conference to which they belong. I really believe this time, when you are proposing to reorganize our Church, is not the time to be working overtime over the basis we have had in the past.

J. F. Goucher: This is a much broader question than may appear on the face of it. In 1812, when the first delegated General Conference met, it was chosen on the basis of a ministerial representation. Previous to that time the preachers were the Church, in their own thinking at least. Laymen took comparatively little interest in the Church matters and were expected to give very little time to its affairs. Even at that time, however, there was a growing feeling that the laymen were an integral part of the Church and should have definite representation in its direction. But there has been a great democratizing process going on through the intervening decades. This is having tremendous emphasis at the present time not only in Europe, but in America. It has come to be recognized in matters of State and in matters of the Church. The numerical strength of the laity as a basis of representation is not only in the direction of the trend of the times, but is an embodiment of a principle which the Church has already put on record. It only gives a fuller and more official recognition of the fact that laymen are an integral part of the Church, a most important part of the Church, and should have representation in its councils according to their strength and importance. Now, if we look at the working of the plan as it is, we find it is peculiar and unjust. The multiplying of Conferences to increase representation which has been hinted at as possible has actually occurred, not once or twice, but repeatedly, and Conferences which were not entitled to four or six delegates have thereby secured the enlarged number. In consequence there is an undue proportion of a small and weak

with a large and disproportionate number of delegates in the General Conference. There are thirteen Conferences in the Methodist Episcopal Church, with twenty-six General Conference delegates, and they have an aggregate of only 84,506 members. There are two Conferences with 211,148 members and only twenty-six delegates. Another five Conferences have twenty delegates and only 56,825 members, while there is a single Conference with 707,000 members and only twelve delegates, and there is a Conference with 441,000 members and only fourteen delegates. These illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely. The fact is, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, eleven per cent of the members have twenty per cent of the delegates in the General Conference because representation is on the ministerial basis. A similar condition exists in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There is another important question involved. That is this: I do not speak of piety nor of devotion nor of zeal for righteousness, nor of personal sacrifice; but I do say that the environment of these small Conferences usually is such as to make it necessary for the pastors to struggle so tremendously hard with their local problems that they have no time to lift up their eyes and behold the fields beyond, white already to harvest. In other words, frequently they are characterized by intenseness and provincialism. We are not planning for a General Conference in which, as in former times, when the General Conference did all the legislating, local and otherwise, it may be necessary to have a large representation from each particular area to guard local interests. We are planning for a General Conference having to do only with general connectional legislation. Therefore we especially need men of broadest vision. There is another matter entering into this problem of the ministerial basis. In many of these areas a person has a little patch of ground or a little business of some kind, and they give him \$200 or \$300 a year or less, and he takes charge of a hundred people or less, sometimes only twenty or thirty. His zeal is to be commended. He is called a regular preacher, but he has a mere handful of people in his care and is giving only a part of his time to the ministry. Yet he is a member of the General Conference and is an offset as a pastor in the basis of representation to a pastor with two thousand members, more or less, and who of necessity is looking upon a broad horizon and adjusting his ministry to the world problems. In the present plan of the ministerial basis there is more than one manifest injustice. If there were a purpose to take the slightest advantage of the administration of these local areas, it would be a different proposition; but as the General Conference is to deal with world problems solely, it should be predominantly composed of delegates with world vision. I think it is of the first importance that as we have provided for local legislation in

the regional areas by Regional Conferences, so we ought to say that the members of the General Conference, whose chosen function, whose sole function is legislation for the connectional interest, should come from the class with the largest horizon and who are most vitally related through knowledge of, interest in, and coöperation with the great world movements. As Regional Missionary Conferences will have so small a number, the basis of membership, and as the work they must represent will be so scattered, and as they will of necessity include a great many appointments with a comparatively small membership, it will make it very difficult to procure a satisfactory representation upon the basis of fourteen thousand members, and the representation may not be as widely diffused as necessities would seem to require. I would like to see the determination of the representation for the Regional Missionary Conferences placed in the hands of the General Conference and let the Regional Missionary Conference, under regulations determined by the General Conference, elect its delegates to the General Conference. As the Regional Missionary Conferences will include many diverse, widely-scattered, but partially developed units, I would prefer to see the Regional Missionary Conferences elect their delegates to the General Conference, so that they may select from time to time such delegates as may be an adequate representation of the divergent interests and scattered localities rather than have the choice be upon the basis of fourteen thousand members elected by the strange Conference. You have heard that some of these smaller appointments have special need for representation. That is accentuated when you go into a country with diverse languages and dialects—for instance, China, Japan, the Philippines, and Malaysia. There will be Regional Missionary Conferences there where the fourteen-thousand-members plan would not give as just and so adequate representation as there would be if the Regional Missionary Conferences should elect a stated number, having due regard to a representation of the diverse interests included in that area. Therefore I would like to see this item stricken out for the present where it refers to the Regional Missionary Conferences and simply vote upon so much as deals with Regional Conferences; then when we get through with the details of the Regional Conference, we can come back and insert whatever method of procedure is determined upon for the Regional Missionary Conferences.

Edwin M. Randall: I wish to direct attention to this fact: that the disparity in the representation between the smaller Conferences and the larger Conferences, to which Dr. Goucher has called attention, is not due to the fact that representation has been based upon the representation of the ministers to the Annual Conference, but upon the fact that the membership required

for the organization of the Conference is below that required for representation in the General Conference. That will be true whether the basis for the organization of the General Conference and the representation in the General Conference is upon the number of ministers or the number of the membership. If it requires 10,000 members to organize an Annual Conference, and if the membership for representation in the General Conference shall be above that, which I think it will be—

Edgar Blake: Fourteen thousand.

Edwin M. Randall: Then every Conference organized with a membership of ten thousand will be entitled to representation in the General Conference, although it is four thousand short of the usual basis of representation, which will give a smaller Conference representation in excess of their relative membership. The argument that is presented would be an argument against organizing a Conference with a membership below that required in the General Conference. The same possible danger exists in both cases. It gives me great pleasure to agree with Dr. Goucher when I can in his insistence that the General Conference ought to draw men into its membership with the largest horizon, and I want to say that the horizon is bigger from the great mountains and plains of the West than it is the canyons of New York City, and that in these great and growing fields where the constructive work of the Church is being done and where we are laying foundations for bigger things in the future as we are in the West, and particularly in the Northwest, where about Puget Sound we are laying the foundation for the center of a population which will make the New Yorker feel small when he comes out there.

J. F. Goucher: You won't be there then.

Edwin M. Randall: No, sir; but we are laying the foundation for it. But let that pass. Our Church in the Western fields and our Church in the men we have in the mission fields abroad have not only able men of superior quality, but have placed them under conditions most favorable for largeness of vision, and in those fields the Church has developed some of its most magnificent leaders. Furthermore, in fields of that sort, where, necessarily, because of the meagerness of the population of the country, the individual Churches must have smaller membership than in the larger cities—and that is true of all rural districts, no matter whether in the older parts, where the average membership of the individual Church is less than in the large cities—the interests of the administration and the exigencies of the cases that call for General Conference attention have standing in the General Conference, are relatively in excess of those in the more congested places, where the average congregation is larger, and therefore I believe it is a just basis of representation that

would permit the weaker young Conference to have a representation a little in disproportion to its membership.

Bishop Hamilton: There are difficulties on both sides, and I have a case on hand since I have come here. But let us go back. We have now, say, one-eighth of the entire membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church that is in the State of Ohio. If we had proceeded upon this basis originally, you would never have had any representation in the General Conference from territories that needed representation, and we would never create any opportunity for revision in certain fields that we would not otherwise know about if we didn't have some representation over there. Do you know that the great struggle is on here for prohibition, and we are away off to one side where the temperance societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church obtain no heed? Is it not possible for us to use influence to get a little money from that temperance society to combat the money from New York, helping the other side? If you centralize on numbers, you may have three-fourths of your representation, if there should happen to come that number, in the State of Ohio, and all the extension of the Church in foreign fields would not have any representation. The idea that Brother Goucher has here, that there is no vision except where there is a big crowd, is a wonderful mistake. I have been over the world where I saw people on the outside that happened to know more than those on the inside who were shut up on the inside and couldn't see outside. Dr. Fairburn said it is infinitely more important for Englishmen to come to America than for Americans to go to England, because when a young couple marry and go to a foreign field they carry something with them to know something about. It won't do to leave all the new world that we expect to conquer without representation at all. I see the difficulty of it, but somehow or other you can reach it so that you will not tie up the Mission Conferences in foreign fields or in this country where we have such immense territory as in Alaska. You must look at this matter with a broader vision. You can't sit down in New York or Baltimore and look out and not see the rest of the country. There are difficulties in both directions, but the way the Church has grown in foreign fields is by representation through ministers. Lastly, I have never yet known that the vast large fields with limited representation and new men have ever influenced legislation in the General Conference to any great extent. That has always been done, when done, by men of long experience representing larger territories with great wealth and institutions that have gone out from the center, but those men do have representation and can appeal to you just as this brother from Porto Rico can say: "We are so far off, and you won't help us."

Edgar Blake: May we have the motion before us stated?

Secretary Thomas: Dr. Randall first withdrew his motion, and then F. M. Thomas moved to substitute the words for "fourteen thousand" "ten thousand." Dr. Ainsworth renewed Dr. Randall's motion that no new Annual Conference should be organized unless there were twenty-five ministers in full connection therewith.

Edgar Blake: Our confusion arises in part from our trying to settle the principle and a lot of details at the same time, and it is a rather difficult thing to do. It appears to me that the question we should settle first is whether the standard required for the organization of the Annual Conference should be based on a certain membership or ministerial membership, and then we can settle the details later. If the motion is in order, I move that it be the sense of the Joint Commission that the standard required for the organization of an Annual Conference be based on a certain membership.

The motion was seconded by several.

F. M. Thomas: I withdraw my amendment for the present.

W. N. Ainsworth: I will withdraw mine.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then the motion of Dr. Blake is before the house.

F. M. Thomas: This is to be confined to the United States?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

F. M. Thomas: I am satisfied that a certain membership should be the basis for forming new Conferences, and especially does this apply to the West. The ministerial element in the West is more or less shifting, especially in the representation of the Church, South. The other, population, is fixed and definite and does not change. If you make it ministerial, there will always be the ambition to create a false basis for representation; but if you make it membership, there will be that just and righteous ambition to increase the membership to a point where it shall be sufficient to have representation in the law-making body of the Church, and there is no question but that the modern trend is toward the people and not toward ministerial representation.

A vote being taken on the motion of Dr. Blake, the same was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, I understand other motions were withdrawn. Now, shall they be introduced as before?

John M. Moore: I renew Brother Thomas's motion that the membership shall be fixed at 10,000 instead of 14,000.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was lost.

Edgar Blake: I move that we approve the paragraph as it stands now.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now the question is upon the whole Section No. 4.

A vote being taken, the section was approved.

Edgar Blake: Now turn to "Meetings." Section 4 reads:

Each Regional Conference shall meet on the first Wednesday of May, 1920, and thereafter on the same day and month every second year at such place as the Regional Conference may determine.

Special session of a Regional Conference shall be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

Now, we offer for the whole of that the following:

Each Regional Conference shall meet for organization immediately succeeding the organization of the General Conference and at such other times and places as the Regional Conference itself shall determine.

I move its approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: You have just now adopted the section on "Meetings," which should be marked Section 5. Now pass on to the section marked "Presiding Officers," which should be Section 7, and this remains without change. Then Section 7, which should be changed to Section 8, is stricken out and for that is substituted the following:

Section 8. All other matters of procedure shall be governed by such rules and regulations as the Regional Conference shall from time to time prescribe.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): My attention is called to the fact that we haven't acted on 6 and 7.

Edgar Blake: No; and I will move the approval of No. 6, affecting bishops.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now, Section 7, in reference to the Regional Conference, is as follows:

Whenever a Regional Conference is in session it shall require the presence of two-thirds of the whole number of delegates to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a less number may take a recess or adjourn from day to day or approve the journal at the final session of the Regional Conference.

I move the approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Denny: I ask unanimous consent that "the bishops" shall be "these bishops." Otherwise it might be open to the interpretation that it was the bishops from the whole Church and not from this particular region.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Why not say "said bishops"?

Bishop Denny: I don't like that word "said"; but I am sorry that I can't get what I want, and I will accept the word "said" instead of "these."

By unanimous consent the change was made.

Edgar Blake: Now I move the adoption of the new Section 8.

E. C. Reeves: I offer an amendment "not in conflict with any other provision of this Constitution," so that it will read: "All other matters of procedure shall be governed by such rules and regulations as the Regional Conference shall from time to time prescribe not in conflict with any other provision of this Constitution." Because this is constitutional law; and if you adopt it you give the Regional Conference the right to make any regulations.

Rolla V. Watt: What is the necessity for that, in view of the restriction we have?

Edgar Blake: A reading of the two will clearly indicate. Read that section beginning "Subject to."

J. W. Van Cleve: I think that is quite the thing.

Henry Wade Rogers: Why is not that provided for by the last paragraph in Section 4 already adopted, that no Regional Conference shall make any rule or regulation contrary to or in conflict with any rule made by any General Conference, etc.?

E. C. Reeves: Why is not this as forcible as the other?

Henry Wade Rogers: What is the necessity of this, in view of the fact that we passed the other?

E. C. Reeves: There won't be any question.

Bishop Cooke: The point is, though, that the other had been adopted.

A. J. Nast: The other has reference to the distinct powers in Section No. 4, and this is as to the general condition.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: It only relates to procedure and nothing else.

E. C. Reeves: All right, I will withdraw my motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): The question is on the approval of Section 8.

A vote being taken, the section was approved.

Edgar Blake: Now, shall we go back and take up Section 1, which defines the bounds of the Regional Conferences?

W. N. Ainsworth: I move that we proceed to finish these special matters that were referred to the Committee.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Then turn to Article 6. May I ask the attention of the Committee to one direction? Read the old Article 6. That should be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

The General Conference shall be composed of one ministerial and one lay delegate from each Regional Conference and Missionary Regional Conference for each fourteen thousand Church members in full connection therewith or fraction of two-thirds thereof, provided that each Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to at least one hundred ministerial and lay

delegates in equal numbers in the first session of the General Conference. The numerical basis of representation may be changed by the General Conference, provided that the General Conference shall be composed of not less than six hundred nor more than eight hundred ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers.

The number of delegates to which a Regional Conference is entitled shall be apportioned among and elected by the several Annual Conferences of the jurisdiction on the basis of the number of Church members in full connection therewith, provided that each Annual Conference shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay delegate.

Rolla V. Watt: I move the adoption of that.

F. M. Thomas: I call your attention to the fact that you have made as a basis one ministerial delegate from each Missionary or Regional Conference for 14,000 or a fraction of two-thirds thereof. You allow representation in the General Conference for a membership of about 10,000, but you will not allow a new Conference to be organized unless it has 14,000 members. That is manifestly unjust. In the second place, under the present rule neither New Mexico nor Arizona with their combined membership could be represented in the General Conference because you could not organize unless you call that an old Conference. You allow an old Conference with about 10,000 representation in the General Conference, and will not allow a new one to be organized unless it has 14,000.

John F. Goucher: In your Church you allow your old ministers to smoke, but you don't allow your new ones to smoke.

Edgar Blake: This applies only to the first session of the General Conference. We provide later that the General Conference may change this basis from time to time, provided that it shall not consist of less than 600 nor more than 800. Now, in view of the fact that the membership of the reorganized Church will probably increase at the rate of 800,000 to 1,000,000 every quadrennium, that will necessitate a rising numerical basis of representation continually, and we shall overcome the difficulty which Dr. Thomas refers to.

F. M. Thomas: As the extension is going on now, the effete East will keep ahead of the vigorous West.

Edgar Blake: It is a good thing to keep facts within our view. One member has told how a certain section of the Northwest is developing at a tremendous rate and will soon surpass New York.

Edwin M. Randall: Not before we organize.

Edgar Blake: I am glad to know that. In the particular area from which the member comes every Annual Conference decreased its membership except one, and that was Alaska.

Edwin M. Randall: Our decrease was due to the fact that the greatest Church in our Conference cut one-third of its members off its books.

Edgar Blake: There was a decrease in nearly every Conference.

David G. Downey: I want to make a little inquiry in regard to this basis of representation. Is it the purpose of the Commission that the Missionary Regional Conference shall be on the same basis of membership for representation, 14,000, as the Conferences in the United States? A little while ago we specified that the basis for the organization in the new Conferences within the space of the United States should be 14,000. Now, here we are making the basis of representation in the Missionary Regional Conferences the same, 14,000. I am not discussing the matter, but I just wanted to know what was the purpose in mind.

Edgar Blake: I may say with reference to that that the Committee did not consider the limitations of the membership necessary for the organization of the Annual Conference, restricting that to the United States. It was not discussed as I now recall. We provide in this that the basis for representation in the General Conference shall be the same both in the Regional and in the Missionary Regional Jurisdiction.

David G. Downey: I simply call attention to the fact that at one place we seem to make a difference between the Missionary and the Regional. I also assume that while we have voted concerning representation from the Missionary Regional Conferences, the whole question of Regional Conferences is still to be decided upon.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Inasmuch as this is only a provision for the first annual session, when so vast an amount of legislation will be necessary for the Missionary Regional Conferences as well as the Conferences in the United States, it seems to me they ought to have a pretty full representation in that session; and this applies only to that session. After that that matter will be so important that the General Conference may and can make representation as it pleases.

John F. Goucher: As the Regional Missionary Conferences are so small in number as to the basis of membership and as they are so much scattered that there will of necessity be a great many comparatively small appointments, it will make it very difficult to pursue a representation upon the basis of 14,000 members, and that representation will not be as widely diffused as the necessity would seem to require. I would like to see the basis of representation of the Regional Missionary Conferences put into the hands of the General Conference itself and that the Regional Missionary Conference should elect a certain number of members to represent it in the General Conference. I do not know whether I make myself clear or not. You have heard that some of these smaller appointments

have special need for representation. That is accentuated when you come to consider their diverse interests, such as China and Japan and the Philippines and Malaysia. There will be Regional Missionary Conferences where to require 14,000 members as a basis of representation would not be as adequate and just a representation of that regional missionary area as it would be for the Regional Missionary Conference to elect a stated number, having due regard to the representation of the diverse interests included in that area. Therefore I would like to see this stricken out by the President where it refers to the Regional Missionary Conferences. Simply vote upon it as conferring upon the Regional Conferences, and then when we get through the details we could come back and insert whatever method of procedure is determined upon.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): Do you make that as a motion?

John F. Goucher: Yes.

Edgar Blake: I do not doubt that we shall take that item up later.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): We feel in our Church that a most delicate situation will arise in Europe, and we want to hold our members in all those belligerent countries. I believe that one-third of our membership in Europe is German.

A. J. Nast: At least that or more.

Bishop Hamilton: Now, you can see that unless this obtains you will have at the close of the war a very delicate and difficult and almost impossible situation to represent all these different countries and hold them together.

Edgar Blake: We are not discussing that. We are passing over that.

Bishop Hamilton: No, sir. There is a motion.

John F. Goucher: That we strike out the words "or missionary regions."

E. B. Chappell: Why not leave off the entire second paragraph?

Edgar Blake: Dr. Goucher's motion is that we defer consideration of the relation of the Missionary Regional Conferences if there is no objection to that.

John F. Goucher: That is it.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now I move the adoption of the first paragraph.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

J. W. Van Cleve: I want to ask a question. It has been repeatedly stated that this holds good only for the first Conference. I do not find it so provided. Does that depend upon the

fact that the first General Conference has power to do anything it wants?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Yes.

Edgar Blake (reading):

The number of delegates to which a Regional Conference is entitled shall be apportioned among and elected by the several Annual Conferences of the jurisdiction on the basis of the number of Church members in full connection therewith, provided that each Annual Conference shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay delegate.

Rolla V. Watt: What is the reason for saying that the number of delegates to which a Regional Conference is entitled shall be apportioned among and elected by the several Annual Conferences?

Edgar Blake: Because in the first paragraph we simply apportion the number of delegates to which the Regional Conferences shall be entitled on the basis of 14,000 members within the Regional Conferences. Then we provide that the number of delegates to which the Regional Conferences shall be entitled shall be apportioned among and elected by the Annual Conferences. The delegates are not to be elected by the Regional Conferences, but by the Annual Conference.

A. J. Nast: I would like to move, as we did in the preceding paragraph, to postpone consideration of that part on missionary regions.

J. W. Van Cleve: There is a question I have not heard answered as to the provision that ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members.

Edgar Blake: That will immediately follow.

Bishop Denny: I would like to ask right here, so that it may be clearly understood, just what apportionment of the delegates there will be to the different Regional Conferences under this section we are about to adopt. I have had placed in my hands a set of figures the accuracy of which I do not guarantee. We are to have, I understood from Dr. Blake, about 748 members of the General Conference. Is that correct, Doctor?

Edgar Blake: Yes—that is, on the basis of the returns for 1915, including probationers. Probationers are not now included in the basis of representation.

Bishop Denny: But with 100 at least from each Regional Conference, that would change the proportion.

Edgar Blake: I don't quite catch your point.

Bishop Denny: There would be at least 100 delegates from each Regional Conference.

Edgar Blake: Yes.

Bishop Denny: Now, taking these additions through the country, it would make very little difference in the proportion-

ate representation that would come out as the result. Here is the point in my mind. I think a clear statement would show that two-thirds of the total number would amount to 474, and the delegations now from the territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church would have 398, which would put them within seventy-six of two-thirds of the General Conference, not including the representations to come from the foreign-speaking Conferences in the country. How many the delegates in these foreign Conferences in this country would make I do not know, but it comes perilously near putting our branch of the Church in the reorganized Church in the position of having a trifle less than one-third of the delegations to the General Conference. Is that the purpose? I simply raise the question.

Bishop McDowell: Bishop Denny a moment ago brought to my notice this query which he has now brought to the notice of the Joint Commission. I have not done any of this figuring myself for reasons that are well understood. I am not strong on this kind of work. I immediately asked Dr. Blake to take account of this question which Bishop Denny has raised, and I give the public assurance to Bishop Denny which I gave to him privately, with an addition to it. The public assurance is that no final vote is to be taken upon this matter with any numerical injustice or inequality to our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as we must now refer to them. Furthermore, I give the public assurance, in response to his question, that we thought we were exactly preserving the numerical fairness and equity in the situation, and I appeal to Dr. Chappell and Dr. Hyer if that is not true; and if it transpires that an error has been made in the calculation so that in the first General Conference there would be this palpable injustice, of course we must make such revision as will be necessary to correct that palpable injustice and to protect the brethren of the Church, South, from the operation of figures if they work any injustice. I make that statement, and Mr. Simpson and the other members of the Committee are in full harmony with me, I know.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: They are.

Edgar Blake: Certainly.

Bishop McDowell: Now, instead of discussing on the basis of what we don't know, we should regard that as held in abeyance and refer it back to a couple of expert figurers to see how this matter works out.

A. J. Lamar: I want to ask Mr. McDowell a question.

Bishop McDowell: Certainly.

A. J. Lamar: Don't you think all this difficulty would be easily obviated, even if the facts are as Bishop Denny has

stated, by substituting three-fourths for two-thirds wherever the action of the Regional Conference has to be approved and confirmed by the General Conference?

Edgar Blake: We have not got that far.

Bishop Cranston: I wanted to call attention to it while it was in my mind.

Edgar Blake: Now, I move the adoption of the part reading: "The ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual Conference, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members of the Annual Conference."

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake (reading):

(2) Ministerial delegates to the General Conference shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference for at least four years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the General Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference which elected them.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Denny: From what time do you calculate membership—admission on trial or full connection?

Bishop McDowell: Full connection.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): We never recognize a man as a member until full connection.

A vote being taken, the second paragraph was approved.

Edgar Blake: The third paragraph reads as follows:

(3) Lay delegates shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least five years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the General Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference which elected them.

I move its approval.

Bishop McDowell: I would not like to offer an opinion off-hand on that. All I am anxious about, and all we are anxious about, is that any palpable unfairness shall be corrected by whatever process is necessary. I suggest, therefore, that it be referred to a couple of the brethren skillful in the matter of figuring, to see just what is necessary to be corrected.

A. J. Lamar: I was making the suggestion.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Would it not be well, in order to bring it into concrete form, that it be referred to Brother Lamar and Brother Blake to make that investigation?

A. J. Lamar: I hope not. I am tired; I am not in a condition to figure.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Some of the rest of us are very tired too. We have been up considerably at night.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): We will take a vote on the motion.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Bishop Denny: Dr. Lamar has been greatly burdened in a way that none of the rest of us has been. He is looking after all the financial matters for our side. If the Commission will allow Bishop Candler to make a suggestion of the one to do the figuring, it would be satisfactory.

A. J. Lamar: Bishop Candler will not be here. Let us name a man right here. I think we had better.

Dr. Blake: I think it would be an advantage to have some one on this committee who has been associated in the work of our Committee from the beginning. We have several representatives from the Southern Church on there—Dr. Chappell and Dr. Hyer. They have been giving it very good attention.

A. J. Lamar: Substitute Dr. Chappell for me.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): One at a time, gentlemen. Some one nominates Dr. Chappell to be on this committee in place of Brother Lamar. Is that agreed to?

It was unanimously agreed to.

Edgar Blake: Now I move the tentative approval of the second paragraph.

Bishop Cranston: I have heard it said that the figures have changed considerably since 1915 and will change more before the Constitution is voted upon. You may eliminate the probationers from your count; but other things may more than offset the number of probationers, and you may find whatever figures you make as a basis will prove misleading when you come to the time of organization, and it would be safer to adopt the fraction three-fourths than to depend upon figures for insuring equity.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The fourth paragraph reads:

(4) Each Annual Conference may elect reserve ministerial and lay delegates, not exceeding three each and not exceeding the number of its delegates.

I move its approval.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Denny: I think it is better to strike out "not exceeding three each." I think it should be "not exceeding the number of its delegates." It is hardly right to elect more lay delegates than ministerial. Why do you say "not exceeding three each"?

Edgar Blake: If the Annual Conference has less than three, they cannot elect more than that many delegates.

Bishop Denny: All right. I think it is covered.

A vote being taken, the motion to approve Section 4 was carried.

Edgar Blake: Section 5 reads as follows:

The General Conference shall be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members.

I move its approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now turn to the section on powers, Subsection 7:

To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy, to fix the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, and to retire the same.

Then we add:

Provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed.

Bishop Cooke: I wish to amend. The first amendment is not material. Strike out the word "by" and insert the word "from" in the second line.

Edgar Blake: That matter was considered in the Committee, and it was decided that it should be "by" rather than "from." For instance, Regional Conference No. 1 may see fit to elect a bishop outside of its jurisdiction from Regional Conference No. 5.

Bishop Cooke: All right. The second amendment is, I desire to insert after the word "that" in the fourth line the following: "Any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendent to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision, provided that the majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which said bishop is assigned shall not object to said assignment."

David G. Downey: Why not say, "shall agree to said assignment"?

Bishop Cooke: There is a reason in that.

Bishop McDowell: That is only a matter of editing.

C. M. Bishop: "Provided that a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which said bishop is assigned shall concur in said assignment." I offer that.

Edgar Blake: We accept that.

Bishop Cooke: Another amendment I would like to offer. After the word "and" in line second from the bottom insert "all the Regional Conferences to which."

Edgar Blake: We had that in and struck it out because we didn't want it repeated.

Bishop Cooke: All right.

Bishop Cranston: I want to inquire of the Committee if this proviso contemplates that the consent of the regional delegates shall be secured at the seat of the General Conference, or does it depend on the regional action or process?

Bishop McDowell: It is a process that can only take place at the seat of the General Conference. It would, therefore, inevitably require that the Regional Conference which would be there present should act at that time and place. Otherwise it could not be done.

Bishop Cranston: How are these two things related—the consent of the resident bishops in the Regional Conference and the consent of the delegates?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That relates to a different matter.

Bishop Cranston: You require both?

Bishop McDowell: No. Let me explain. The first paragraph relates to the assignment for residential purposes; and this provides that the General Conference shall have power to assign the bishop to a residence within any jurisdiction, with the consent of the delegates of the Regional Conference from which he is taken and to which he is sent.

A. J. Lamar: I wish to propose an amendment which will not be accepted, but which is important. I propose to amend by striking out the words "and to retire the same."

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: You want to strike out simply "and to retire." "The same" applied to the other two.

A. J. Lamar: I want to strike out the word "retire," and I want to give the reasons for proposing that amendment. I am fully convinced that the question of retirement should be in the hands of the people who know the man and who have elected him to office. I think the very same reason and every reason which requires that the Regional Conference shall make the bishop demand that the retirement of that bishop shall be in the same hands. His labors are largely among them. They are the people who know him and who know the character of his work, and they are the people that are best fitted to decide upon whether he is an effective man or whether he should be retired. I would be utterly unwilling to take a bishop from the region in which I will fail as an itinerant preacher and leave the question of his retirement to a body of men in Maine or California or Texas who have had no experience whatever with that bishop and who know nothing of the character of the man or the character of his work. The people who are acquainted with him are the people with whom he has labored and the same people who elected him as a fit man for bishop and put their seal of approval upon him, and they are the people who should deal with the question of his retirement.

Edgar Blake: I simply want to call attention to this: The point made by Dr. Lamar is that the men who elect him should be the ones to retire him. I desire to call attention to this fact, that we have made provision for the possible assignment of a bishop elected by one jurisdiction to service in another jurisdiction, providing that the delegates at the Regional Conference from which he is to be taken concur in said assignment. That would mean that a bishop might be elected by Region No. 1 and in some subsequent quadrennium might be assigned for residential supervision to Region No. 3. Now, on the point that you have made would you have that bishop come back to No. 1 for retirement, or would you have his connection determined by the action of Region No. 3? I assume you would want his retirement to depend on the action of the region in which he is serving.

A. J. Lamar: I would have to answer by a statement which does not answer it and yet does. The statement is this: You are dealing with exceptions to the rule. My motion deals with the rule. As a rule that transfer will not be. There will be more bishops remaining in the regions from which elected than transferred from one to another.

Edgar Blake: The rule must cover all cases. Now, if retirement depended upon the action of the delegation that elected him, then the desire for retirement would be by those who know the bishop best, those whom he has served, provided he chances to be in another region. Now, there is another reason. I think there is a serious objection—

Bishop Mouzon: If Brother Blake will be kind enough to let me offer an amendment, I think I can clarify the situation.

Edgar Blake: All right.

Bishop Mouzon: Amend by adding the following: "Provided that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which he resides at the time."

The amendment was seconded.

Edgar Blake: Again, if a bishop is to be retired by the Regional Conference he is serving at the time of retirement, and by its action alone, that would make it possible in the case of a regional delegation of one hundred men for sixty-seven men to retire that bishop.

Bishop Mouzon: You misunderstand.

Edgar Blake: I am discussing the motion made by my distinguished friend Dr. Lamar.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): The amendment is before us by common consent, but Dr. Blake is discussing the whole question.

Bishop Mouzon: This is a substitute for Dr. Lamar's amendment and has been seconded.

Dr. Lamar: I raise the point of order that it is out of order to offer a substitute for the amendment which has been offered and upon which the member has the floor.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): That is right. There is another matter involved here. I have known all along that this matter has been passed and approved; and if you want strictly to keep parliamentary usage, you will have to reconsider.

Bishop Denny: I beg pardon, but we have not voted on this.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): In another place.

F. M. Thomas: That clause was voted on in the first part of No. 7.

Bishop Denny: We haven't voted on No. 7 yet.

F. M. Thomas: It has just be voted upon.

Bishop Denny: Does the record show that?

F. M. Thomas: It does.

W. N. Ainsworth: I do not understand the record, and I would like to have the record read.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): I had to go by the record.

Bishop Cooke: I understand we voted for this, and then Dr. Lamar introduced an entirely new amendment.

A. J. Lamar: I do not understand it that way, but in order to clarify the situation I move to reconsider the action by which we adopted that section.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: I ask unanimous consent for the presentation of Dr. Lamar's amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): I said by common consent I allowed the matter to go forward with the knowledge of the situation as given me by the Secretary; and Brother Blake has the floor, and I do not think it necessary to go back and reconsider when we really did it by common consent.

Edgar Blake: What I was trying to point out was this: That I think there is a danger in permitting so small a number of men to retire a bishop, especially in view of the fact that sometimes a bishop in his administration is certain to incur the enmity of certain brethren or to disapprove of certain brethren whom he is obliged to disappoint in his administration. We have known that in our own Conference. A case was cited for us in Committee where a certain delegate declared his intention to vote for the retirement of a certain bishop to get even with that bishop, who had disappointed him. I think the retirement of a bishop should be taken out of the hands of a limited number whom he has served and whom in the honest administration of his work he has been found to disappoint and put into the hands of another Gener-

al Conference. More than that, we have found in our own experience that the legislation enacted by our General Conference in 1912, providing for the retirement of a bishop by an age limit, seems likely in all probability to do away with the necessity of our having ever to have to retire a bishop by force except under due process of law—that is, for some charge that might be preferred against him. If we are to have an age retirement limit, that condition of retirement should not be fixed by a small regional delegation, but rather by the entire body of the General Conference and by uniform rules of general application. The only thing I see that is desirable in this paragraph is to change the word "retire" to "superannuate." The two words mean the same with us; but I understand that members of the South Church have not adopted the word "retire," and they use the word "superannuate." I think the retirement should be in the hands of the General Conference, so that an age limit would be the same, and it should be in the hands of the General Conference, so that no small body of men can retire any bishop. If you provide that the General Conference shall have the power to retire, then I see no objection to the motion of Bishop Mouzon that the Conference shall retire a bishop only with the consent of a majority of the delegates from the region he has served.

W. N. Ainsworth: I wish to present a substitute for the whole, and it reads as follows: Amend by inserting immediately after the clause "and to confirm and retire the same" "provided no bishop shall be retired without a two-thirds vote of the General Conference." And I present that for the reason that I believe, with Dr. Blake, that a bishop has been consecrated by the General Conference and therefore passed up as a bishop of the whole Church, and his retirement should be in the hands of a body that is a representation of the whole Church, and this action should take place in the General Conference; but if we retire a bishop on the vote of less than two-thirds—and I use the word "retire" in the sense of "superannuate," as Dr. Blake used it—we might find ourselves in this very anomalous situation: that a vote slightly greater than a majority vote, but less than a two-thirds vote of the General Conference, might be opposed to the confirmation of a bishop elect. They could not defeat his confirmation at the General Conference at which he is proposed for consecration, but after a lapse of one quadrennium a majority vote could retire that bishop whom they had not desired to be consecrated in the beginning; so that it is in keeping with the fundamental law which we have already passed requiring a two-thirds vote to refuse consecration to a bishop if we say also that he shall be

retired only by a two-thirds vote of the General Conference. I submit that as a substitute for the whole.

Henry Wade Rogers: This is a very important matter, and I wish to suggest that I think it would be exceedingly helpful and wise if we could, in framing this Constitution for the new Church, incorporate a provision such as we have in the Constitution of many States which fix a retiring age. We have in the Constitution of the State of New York—and it is in the Constitution of some other States—a provision that when a judge reaches the age of seventy years he shall be automatically retired. It would prevent a lot of annoying controversy if we can now, while we are framing the Constitution, incorporate into it a provision of that sort, at the same time making other provisions which shall enable, under certain conditions which may arise, the retirement of a bishop either by the consent of the General Conference or by the Regional Conference or regional delegates, as may be deemed best. This involves the thought as to how this shall be exactly expressed; and I would like, with the consent of the gentleman who has introduced the motion to substitute, for him to withdraw his motion and allow me to move that this matter of the retirement of bishops be recommitted with a view of consideration in the Committee of provisions relating to the retirement.

Bishop Mouzon: I offer a substitute for the whole matter—

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): You cannot do that. We have one substitute for the whole matter.

Bishop Mouzon: I would like to inquire exactly as to the situation.

Secretary Thomas: Brother Laniar moved to strike out the words "and retire." Bishop Mouzon moved as a substitute "shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference within which he resides." Then Dr. Ainsworth moved as a substitute for the whole the following: "Provided that no bishop shall be retired without a two-thirds vote of the General Conference."

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): The first thing to do is to vote on this last substitute, and then when that is out of the way we can take on another.

Bishop Mouzon: Dr. Ainsworth's paper, then, was offered as a substitute?

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): Yes.

Bishop Mouzon: And the paper I offer is offered as a substitute for Dr. Laniar's amendment, and the paper I offer reads as follows: Amend simply by adding "provided that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference within which he resides." Speaking to the whole matter, I agree that the General Conference which confirmed

the bishop should retire the bishop. Those two go together, and they ought not to be separated.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton) : We are within one minute of the time of adjournment.

On motion, duly seconded and being put to a vote, the time was extended.

Bishop Mouzon : I also agree that the people who know the bishop best, who know the character of his work and in many instances have known him for many years, and who are the people who have elected him and among whom he has lived and served as a people, ought to have the right to determine finally whether he is to be retired or not. Now, the two go together. The point was well made by Bishop McDowell that when a bishop goes before the Church he should have the backing of the people from whom he comes as well as the backing of the entire Church; and if a bishop is to be retired, he should be retired not merely by a two-thirds vote of the region which elected him and from which he comes, but he should be retired by a vote of the General Conference, provided the region in which he resides concurs in that matter. This obviates entirely the difficulty raised by Dr. Blake—that a minority might retire him, that certain people who had formed a dislike for him might retire him. The whole case is covered here. Possibly some men may not be as familiar with certain Church history as some of us. It will be enough for me to say that there is a very important and vital event in Church history that comes to memory just at this point, and serious difficulties might have been avoided at that time if the Church had been working under a rule of this sort. Therefore I do insist that everything that any man here has insisted upon will be covered if you have this proviso. This does not interfere at all with any automatic retirement at a certain age. That can be arranged for, and this does not in any way conflict with that.

David G. Downy : I should think a bishop would be very particular about throwing this matter of retirement back on a small region. There is nothing that will conduce more to the development of a party spirit and strife and unseemly management than just that very thing. If you get back in a small area, you will get a group of friends who will work for one thing, and you will get another group who will work for another thing, and there will be, I am afraid, the development of a bitter feeling. I believe that the peace of the Church and the safety of the bishops would be much conserved if it might be left very largely in the hands of the General Conference. I assume that if this general principle is left as it is, simply to say that they shall confirm, the General Conference will

adopt suitable rules, and undoubtedly there will be something in the nature of what Judge Rogers suggests as a retiring age limit.

Henry Wade Rogers: I move to refer this whole subject back to the Committee for further consideration.

A. J. Nast: I would like to inquire whether at the last meeting at Baltimore this Joint Commission was not presented with a gavel by Dr. Goucher. What has become of that?

Rolla V. Watt: I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): The member will state the question.

Rolla V. Watt: This is a personal matter. Due to serious and doubtless fatal illness of a member of my household, it is necessary for me to leave for San Francisco this afternoon. I therefore ask to be excused from further attendance on the meetings of this Joint Commission. I assure you no ordinary matter, no mere business call, would induce me to leave this conference, fraught as it is with such wonderful possibilities for the kingdom of God on earth. I am firmly convinced we shall achieve unification, or perhaps I should say that I am firmly convinced that unification will be achieved. I am not so optimistic as to believe that I shall not again have the pleasure of meeting you face to face in a session of this Joint Commission. Indeed, it would not be surprising if we should have several joint meetings before success crowns the efforts of our Churches. I thank you for your courtesies and pray God's blessings upon you and this great work.

The leave was granted.

M. S. Walton: I am compelled to leave this afternoon on account of an engagement that I cannot get around.

The excuse was granted.

The Chairman (Bishop Hamilton): I do hope, unless it is a matter of very great importance, that all of you gentlemen will stay until we have put ourselves in touch with the whole Church, so that we can go home in good standing.

Bishop Cranston: The Commission yesterday referred to the Chairmen of the Joint Commission the matter of preparing for a social service in the afternoon at five o'clock on Sunday. We have conferred about it, and we have thought that Dr. Goucher, who has enjoyed such occasions before, would be the best leader of such a service; and we have asked Dr. Goucher to take charge of that service and make his own program and his own arrangements with the several members who are to participate.

The Secretary: The automobiles will be at the hotel at half past two, and we propose to leave about three or three-thirty.

John F. Goucher: Many I ask the Secretary where we are to meet on Sunday?

Secretary Thomas: I understand we can use this room if we so desire.

Bishop McDowell: I would ask the Committee on Conference to remain for a moment here at this part of the room in order to consider a matter that has been committed to us.

Several members suggested a night session.

Secretary Thomas: I am opposed to meeting at night.

George W. Brown: It is important that we proceed as rapidly as we can. I have to go on Monday.

Bishop Cranston: We have never done any good with any night meetings.

A motion to adjourn was made and, being duly seconded, was put to a vote and carried.

FIFTH DAY, MONDAY, JULY 2, 1917

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Cranston, the Chairman.

Hymn 530, "O Thou in Whose Presence My Soul Takes Delight," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brother Pepper will conduct our devotions.

John R. Pepper: I shall read a short passage from a book of the Bible that I think few of us consult very much. I read the third chapter of Lamentations:

It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.

They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness.

The Lord is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in him.

The Lord is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him.

It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord.

It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth.

He sitteth alone and keepeth silence, because he hath borne it upon him.

He putteth his mouth in the dust; if so be there may be hope.

He giveth his cheek to him that smiteth him: he is filled full with reproach.

For the Lord will not cast off forever.

Our Heavenly Father, we are deeply conscious that it is because thy patience has been with us that we have not been consumed. We magnify thy mercy at this hour, and we worship thee because of thy long-suffering and patient course. We are sensitive to our limitations and to our actual sins. Therefore we have need to come before thee this morning to make confession, and we do ask, O Lord, that we may have forgive-

ness of God for whatever we really have done that was wrong in thought, word, or deed. Do thou bless us this morning as we come into this bright and new day, after the memory of a holy Sabbath with its ministrations. May we be better fitted to do the work committed to our hands because of the services in the sanctuary! O God, we need thy illuminating Spirit this morning! We are dull and blind and cannot see very far. O grant that we may have a touch of thy hand upon us, that the Spirit may unerringly lead us as it will if we commit ourselves to thee, so that we shall not do anything that is foolish or unwise or that would not meet thy holy approbation. Bless every brother who sits around this table; and grant, O Lord, that our each ambition may be to glorify thee and to build up the Church of God of which we are members; and, Lord, as we have come to very important moments in our deliberations, do thou especially lead us at this hour; and grant that we may be able wisely and in the fear of God to decide upon some things that will be definite and that will be for the glory of God and the oncoming of the great Church which, we trust, will lead the hosts of God in our whole land. We pray thy blessing upon our nation, O God. Thou art the God of nations, and therefore we know thou art deeply interested in the things that concern this great land at this time. We ask thee to bless the President of the United States and all who are in authority with him. Give them knowledge and wisdom, that they may so guide the affairs of the nation that we shall be safe from the horrors of war. O Lord, bless the nations which are at war; and, O God, we think this morning of the thousands of homes desolated by the ravages of war, and, O Lord, thou who art the God of the widow and the orphan, do thou be very near to them and give them thy guidance and thy blessing. We know that no one save thee can compensate for such sorrow. Therefore we invoke the presence of God in the home of grief. Bless our own dear ones scattered over a wide area. Bless our homes and our wives and our children. Bless our sick and those who have also entered into service. God be near them!

The Joint Commission then united in saying the Lord's Prayer.

Hymn 533, "Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brother Simpson will lead us in prayer.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Dear Jesus, we are met to-day, as in the days past, to endeavor to do thy work. We know that we are not able to do it without thy help; we know that if we consulted our own feelings and our sympathies with our own prejudices we will get nowhere in doing that which thou

desirest us to do. But if we can come before thee with the earnest desire to find out that which is thy will, with thy name on our lips, thy light in our hearts, thy love with all of us and actuating most, if not all, of us, we can do what we shall attempt to do. We know that thou wilt lead us and guide us, and that the way which seems so dark shall soon be clear to us, and we shall have eternal rest and bliss. O, glorify this day, O Lord! And in everything we do and say let us feel that there is nothing that we wish to do save that which we would be willing to answer unto thee. Remember that thou givest us different associations and different environments in which to live, different surroundings; that thou dost know that all those things influence us in our actions. But O let us know that thou as the Man of Galilee canst override all environments and all prejudices and all influences that lead us away from the one simple single thing for which thou hast called us together—to unify thy Church upon the lines of thy Son. O Lord, we bless thee that thou hast guided us thus far. We had doubted and wondered and worried time and time again. Often we have seen no light apparently before us, no way out of darkness, no way to reconcile the differences of thy people; but we have had faith in thee, however much we have doubted at times. And, lo and behold, in ways we knew not doors were opened; and as we looked the sunlight of thy reconciled countenance shone about us, and we were again on the highway of Christian life. Be with us in the morning, and be with us through all this day; be with us throughout all our lives, and guide and protect us in everything that we do; and O give us the heart to do those things which thou wishest of us! And finally guide us safely where we shall not be a Church, North, nor a Church, South, but in thy kingdom, loving thee above all things, where we shall meet again, singing hallelujah. We thank thee, and we bless thee, O dear Lord. Above all we love thee. Help us that we may hereafter have thee for our guiding star in all our lives. We ask in the name of thy dear Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Hymn 538 was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Call the roll.

Secretary Thomas: The calling of the roll has been dispensed with.

Frank Neff: I move we call the roll during the remainder of the session to show who has remained and who has not remained.

The motion was seconded by Edwin M. Randall and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The roll call resulted as follows: From the Methodist Epis-

copal Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace. Laymen: C. W. Kinne, A. W. Harris, I. G. Penn, J. R. Joy, H. W. Rogers, William Rule, Alex Simpson, Jr., C. M. Stuart. From the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Ministers: Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We will have the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were read.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are there any corrections?

Bishop Denny: Section 2, Subsection 7, the first proviso was amended to read, the third line from the close of the paragraph, "provided that a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which said bishop is assigned shall concur." The words "a majority of" were inserted on Bishop Cooke's motion.

Bishop Cooke: It was accepted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Let the correction be made.

The minutes were then approved.

Secretary Thomas read a letter addressed to Dr. Harris.

Bishop Candler here assumed the chair as Chairman.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): It gives me pleasure to be here. I have not been well for some twelve hours.

Bishop Cranston: May I ask if the Committee has prepared a summary of the changes made in the report up to this moment, so that we can have them before us—the revised report?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The matter which was directly before us was Subsection 7, Section 2, dealing with the powers of the General Conference and especially on the question of the retirement of bishops. The Committee has had a meeting; and if the members will turn to the subject "Powers," under "General Conference" (it is on page 8 of the copy I have), I will state the changes. The Committee reports in favor of inserting in lieu of the words "and confirm and retire the same" the following: "To confirm their elections by a general rule, to supernuminate them upon reaching a determined age, and by a three fourths vote of the General Conference present and vot-

ing to retire them from further effective service in the episcopacy." So that the whole Subsection 7 will read: "To define and fix the privileges and powers and duties of the episcopacy, to fix according to a uniform principle the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, to confirm their election by general rules, to superannuate them upon reaching a determined age, and by a three-fourths vote of the General Conference present and voting to retire them from further effective service in the episcopacy; provided that a bishop shall be assigned for residential supervision to the regional jurisdiction by which he was elected. But no bishop shall be assigned by the General Conference to any Annual Conference for residential supervision unless the Regional Conference shall concur in said assignment; provided also that the General Conference shall have power to assign a bishop to a residence within any jurisdiction with the consent of the delegates from the Regional Conference from which the bishop is to be taken and to which he is to be assigned."

Bishop Mouzon: I have an amendment to offer. The amendment is as follows: Substitute for the committee's amendment to the original report the following: "Provided that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed; and provided, further, that nothing shall preclude the General Conference from adopting rules and regulations in relation to a uniform age limit for the superannuation of bishops."

The amendment was seconded.

Bishop Mouzon: There are one or two things I desire to say. I do believe that there are certain circumstances which justify the retirement of a bishop. I believe it ought to be possible to retire a bishop. It is at least conceivable that it might appear that a bishop is no longer effective, no longer efficient. If such should appear, it ought to be possible to retire him. Now, I submit if you are going to require a three-fourths vote of the General Conference to retire a bishop you will never retire a bishop, or it will be practically impossible to retire one. I wish you to give careful consideration to that point. My point is that if you put the majority so high as three-fourths it will be practically impossible ever to retire a bishop. Now, then, I have another point to make. This amendment is in perfect harmony with the plan provided for the election and confirmation of bishops. A bishop, according to the plan provided in the Constitution we are making, is to be selected by the Regional Conference and confirmed by the General Conference. That should be kept in mind. This amendment provides that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed, and

so the retirement of the bishop takes place in exact harmony with the plan provided for the election of the bishop. We talk about the protection of the minority. Somebody doesn't like to have that said, but we shall have to keep on saying it; and in order to protect the minority we have decided that it is right and proper for the region to elect the bishop, subject to confirmation. If that is right and proper, then it is right and proper that no bishop should be retired contrary to the will of the region in which that Bishop has been living and where he has been serving the Church at least during the quadrennium preceding the session of the General Conference which takes up the matter of his retirement. My amendment covers both of those points: "Provided no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which the bishop's residence is fixed." And since it was generally understood that there would be a provision fixing an age limit for the superannuation of bishops, in order to protect that, this other proviso is added: "And provided, further, that nothing herein shall preclude the General Conference from adopting rules and regulations in relation to a uniform age limit for the superannuation of bishops." I present this to you as a substitute for the amendment that has been offered by the committee.

Bishop Cooke: I would like to amend that amendment in some such way as would prevent the possibility of a Regional Conference holding up the entire General Conference. If it should require absolutely the consent of the Regional Conference before a bishop can be retired, you see at once that it is possible that a bishop could never be retired, because it is self-evident that a Regional Conference could hold up the judgment of the entire body. If it could be so amended that he should be retired until there has been a fair presentation of his case by the Regional Conference from which he comes, then I would have no objection to it, because it would simply be hearing the other side of the case; and if, after the General Conference has heard the representations of the Regional Conference, it should then appear that he should still be retired, surely the Regional Conferences should not have the power to still oppose his retirement. I hardly know, without a whole lot of words, how to make the amendment to express my idea. It can be done if a little time is given to the writing of it.

Bishop Denny: I think none of us has any doubt that what the Church wants to do with the bishops it will do, and I think it should have the right to do with them what it wants to do. We are not considering that phase of the matter just at this time. Now I feel free to speak without any delicacy. I have

never believed that it was a good policy to have an age limit at which men are to retire. Age is not a matter that is fixed by years or months. There are some men old at sixty, and there are other men young at eighty. It would have been a calamity to Methodism, though it is quite unthinkable, that Methodism could at that time have retired John Wesley at eighty. We do not know that another John Wesley or a man of his physical ability or even physical organization may not be reproduced. Some of the best work that Gladstone did was done after he was eighty. We could very well leave this question of retirement to the Regional Conferences; and if the region that elects a man is satisfied with the service of the man, since they alone are to receive the service, what harm does the Church suffer? So that part of Bishop Mouzon's amendment commends itself to my judgment as part of it does not. There is another side to this question that I have thought of. Retire on what grounds? This Church was split on retirement. We have been in that divided condition ever since. Now, it is quite possible that what has happened may happen again. I think that will be universally accepted. We say "may retire a man." It is quite conceivable, if it has not been a fact, that a bishop may be called upon to do in a certain community, a certain Conference or region, things that cross the sentiment of the people of that region. For example, I happen to know of one instance in which, in order to preserve Methodism in a community, a bishop had to transfer a majority of the preachers in the Conference and put in men faithful to Methodism. Now, take that bishop up to the General Conference, and you have no ground set forth in your constitution as a basis for his retirement; and if you would retire him, you would retire a man who has done what needs to be done for the preservation of the Church simply by a vote of the men who are gathered there. If a man is to be retired, the ground should be set forth on which that retirement is predicated. What is it? Is it a physical or a mental failure that would be covered by superannuation? But this word "retire"—retire for cause—may be unpopular with certain of the brethren. It seems to me, for the safety of the Church and for the protection of the bishops—and those of you who have not been in this delicate position don't know how often a bishop needs protection—and for the protection of the bishop there ought to be laid down some limitation, some ground, some statement upon which the retirement is to proceed. If it be the result of an investigation of facts, that might meet the case. Then state within what limit those facts are to fall. But just that general statement that you can retire a bishop—for what? We are in a bad condition now in the country on divorce, and we had to

lay down certain grounds on which divorce may proceed. Incompatibility is one, but you don't propose to lay down any such ground in this amendment or the report from the Committee, which I did not have the honor to see before presented, though I am on the Committee; but here you lay down no specific grounds, and you should lay down something on which the Church may proceed before a bishop can be retired.

Henry Wade Rogers: Personally I am very anxious to see incorporated in this Constitution of the re-established Church, if we succeed in re-establishing it, not merely a recognition of the power to retire a bishop, but some definite, positive statement that when a bishop reaches a certain age, which I shall not now undertake to name, but which I hope before we get through we will name, the bishop will be automatically retired. We threshed that question out in our General Conference. We have had a humiliating experience—humiliating to the Church and humiliating to the Board of Bishops. We have felt that the Church was discredited by the practice which prevailed until within a few years in our Church of reviewing individual bishops, putting them up, so to speak, on the block and looking them over, instituting an inquiry as to their mental or physical condition. We have had so much unfavorable experience with that sort of a thing that at our General Conference in Minneapolis we adopted an automatic retirement provision and inserted it in our Discipline, very much, if I am correctly informed, to the comfort and satisfaction of the Board of Bishops and to our Church as a whole. Now, there is no more reason for passing individually upon bishops than there is upon judges, and for generations in this country it has been deemed wise in our constitutions that when a judge reached a certain age he shall be automatically retired.

Bishop Denny: Is that universal in all the States?

Henry Wade Rogers: Not universal, but in many of them; and if some one would second my motion, I should like to move that we insert in this provision not merely that the General Conference shall have the right to retire, but that when a bishop reaches a certain age, to be inserted later, he shall be automatically retired.

Edwin M. Randall: I second that motion.

F. M. Thomas: I move to amend the report by striking out the words "by general rules to superannuate them upon reaching a determined age," and to add after the word "retire": "for cause herein provided for." I believe that the practice of age superannuation in the case of a bishop is not Methodistic nor just. I think that sooner or later it would apply to the ministry; and as Bishop Denny has well said, ability is not dependent on age. If that law had been applied in the Methodist

Church throughout all the years gone by, it would have deprived the Church of some of its most valued servants. I am sure no member of the Methodist Church here will take offense when I say that six years ago the most potential energy in our Church was past the age limit fixed by your Church—Bishop Wilson. Pardon me for saying so, but I was present at your Conference in 1912, and one of the most vigorous men I ever saw physically and intellectually was Bishop Warren; it seemed a cruel injustice to retire him—there would not be any grounds on which you could justify it except a desire to avoid doing your duty, a desire to keep from looking at each individual case absolutely upon its merits. In your Annual Conference and ours we have to refer men to committees. And why not let that be done in the case of bishops? You can juggle with ethics by applying a general rule, but you cannot determine the capability of men by an age limit. As to the second point, "retired for cause," I believe the General Conference ought to have the right to retire a bishop; and I question very seriously whether it ought to depend upon the action of the Regional Conference, though I am not settled on that. If you put it in the Regional Conference, the time may come when the action of the Regional Conference may be accepted as the determining factor. The time may come when a man does a certain work and becomes very unpopular. I believe the General Conference should be able to retire a bishop for disability or incompatibility or because not acceptable; but if he is guilty of immorality or anything involving a question like that, try him.

Voces: Certainly.

F. M. Thomas: The point is, don't leave the word "retire" without a definition. Don't let a body which can be swept from its feet by the wind retire a man. Under the duties and privileges of a bishop let there be specified the causes for which he may be removed.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Bishop Mouzon offered a substitute. Does not the report contain your amendment, Judge Rogers?

Henry Wade Rogers: No, sir; it recognizes the power to retire, but I want it incorporated that when a bishop reaches a certain age he is automatically retired.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Then Brother Thomas offered an amendment to what?

F. M. Thomas: To the report of the Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The substitute is before you.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: In order to clarify, would it not be wise to take up the two sections of the report separately—

first, whether there should be superannuation by an age limit in the Constitution or by giving the General Conference the right to fix it, and after that is disposed of then to take up the other question of the retirement generally by the consent of the Regional Conference or by a three-fourths vote of the General Conference? If we keep the two together, we are not reaching a position where we can intelligently pass on them.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair thinks that Brother Simpson is right, but we cannot do anything unless you vote.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Then I move, with the consent of those who have made the various amendments, that we take up the question of superannuation on reaching an age limit and debate and conclude that with the various amendments before we treat of the other subject in the report.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That is practically calling for a division of the question, but I will put it to a vote.

The motion having been seconded, a vote being taken, it was carried.

David G. Downey: Now, I want to speak on that point with reference to the wisdom of a time limit. We should bear in mind that we can never legislate for the exceptional man. Legislation always has respect to the average, and we must consider what is best for the largest number. It is true that sometimes that does seem an injustice to an individual, but not to so legislate might do a great injustice to a large number of individuals, and the point that we must very carefully bear in mind is that experience has clearly proved that the average man, even though he be a bishop, reaches his point of efficiency somewhere in the neighborhood of seventy or seventy-five—somewhere between those two ages. Very eminent men have been cited, but other equally eminent men have had the wisdom to take themselves out of the way because they said they preferred to retire before they got to a point where they would think they had no need to retire. I am not at all worried about the General Conference being swept off its feet with the desire to retire a bishop. I have been in too many General Conferences to have any anxiety on that point. I do find that the General Conference is very apt to be swept off its feet by a wave of sentimentality to hold a man in out of respect for his feelings. These bishops have in their hands the destinies of thousands of men and their families. They have to bear very great burdens, and a man who may be very wise in counsel may not be wise after he has reached a certain age in the matter of administration. I call the attention of the brethren to the fact that when a man is retired by an age limit—at least according to the plans that obtain in the Methodist Epis-

copal Church—the Church is not at all deprived of his accumulated years of wisdom. He is in the Board of Bishops for counsel. He has practically everything except the important privilege of presiding at an Annual Conference and making the appointments, and he even presides in an Annual Conference when requested by the bishop who has charge. The thing that is highly important for us to protect is the rights of the thousands of our ministers whose destinies are in the hands of a man; and that man ought to be at the very highest possible point of physical intellect and spiritual efficiency, and we must legislate with respect to the average man, even though he be a bishop.

Bishop McDowell: This is one of the subjects upon which without impropriety a bishop may speak. Brother Blake is surprised at the small exhibition of modesty on my part, but Brother Blake is surprised at any exhibition of modesty.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Where does he come from?

Bishop McDowell: From Chicago, where they don't grow it.

Edgar Blake: I am affected by my environment.

Bishop McDowell: I think it is proper for me to say, and, contrary to my usual custom, I think it is quite right for me to say from the standpoint of the episcopacy that I doubt very much whether the bishops need to concern themselves about protecting themselves or protecting the episcopacy from the Church or the General Conference. I think in every instance, without a single exception, where our General Conference has been obliged to retire a man from effective service in the episcopacy, it has done it with the utmost regret and reluctance and only under a compelling sense of duty. I think there have been individual votes for the retirement of bishops that were not quite worthy, that were vindictive; but I think the Conference as a whole in every instance regretted that matter. I am quite persuaded for myself, and I am sure for the entire Board to which I belong, that we viewed the passage of the law at Minneapolis with the utmost gratification; and the men to whom it has automatically applied have accepted it with gratification. Now, there is a phase of this, at which Brother Downey has just hinted, on which I would like to say a word. A bishop, if he be an all-round man, if he be such a man as the late Bishop Andrews was, if he be such a man as the present Bishop Cranston is, has two very great values. One is his public value, and one is his value within the Board of Bishops and within the smaller parts of the Church; and we have had bishops whose public value was larger than their value as counselors within the Board. Certain bishops in our history have not cared much for the administrative matters that came

within the Board. We have had bishops whose administrative value or whose value as counselors was in excess of the attractiveness of their public appearance. I venture to say this: That while Bishop Andrews presided and did all the things just as acceptably in the last quadrennium of his life as in any previous quadrennium, nevertheless we could have afforded to have relieved him just as we could afford to relieve Bishop Cranston of the wearisomeness of the details of administration, of knocking around the country, of doing the things an effective bishop is compelled to do in order to preserve them for that other great value which centered within the Board of Bishops and within the administrative boards of the Church. I do not doubt that Judge Rogers would agree—I have not conferred with him—that a judge retired automatically does not cease to be of the highest value to the bench and legal profession and legal administration. I have said this because I thoroughly believe in the time limit for retirement in the episcopacy. I believe in it for the reason that I believe the presence of such a provision greatly reduces such peril as a bishop might feel that the other provisions for their retirement are going to be harshly and very rigorously applied. Our time limit, for example, does automatically extend certain pastors. Certain pastors would terminate at the end of the three-year period if there were no time limit upon them where they are extended to a four-year period because there is only one more year, anyhow. Now I come back to what I started with. I do not believe that this is a move which is in any other direction than in the direction of the interest of the Church in the highest character and the best use of its bishops. I am of the opinion that our provision is a wise one, for we recognize by that the individual differences between men. I would not like to come up to the point where I would be obliged myself to decide whether I ought or ought not to retire. I remember the wisdom of Arthur Balfour when he retired from the office of Prime Minister of England. He said: "Just now I have a mind that is flexible; but there may come a time when I shall be inflexible, and I think I had better do this thing now than to wait for the day when I shall not have the flexibility to do it."

Bishop Cranston: Sometimes we Methodists accept words based upon experience with more confidence than words merely of opinion. My experience as a retired bishop is coming to me, of course, gradually; but I assure you that it is very, very satisfactory. If I had been retired by arbitrary action of the General Conference, I might have gone apart and nursed my wounds and lived in the emotional sympathy of my friends, and I might have given myself the task of standing in the way

of all progress in the Church and wasting antipathies toward new propositions, becoming a critic of new enterprises of the Church or of men who might appear, in my judgment, to have been more fortunate in their relationship to the General Conference and all that. But there are so many opportunities, so many temptations to become an obstruction when a man has been put aside by the arbitrary action of a General Conference; and then, of course, there is all the defection of a large number of people in sympathy with a man retired. They protest and shut up their pocketbooks against funds. Now, why not retire a man from the episcopacy at an age that is fixed when the method certainly gives promise of avoiding friction and any justification for the reactionary things from that man's life and his retirement? I do not feel that I have been repudiated. I do not feel that I have been forcibly or arbitrarily turned aside from the duties that pertain to the Christian minister. In other words, the vote was not a vote of lack of confidence. It was a sympathetic expression of my Church, a recognition of the work I had tried to do and an expression of the generous willingness, both in the method itself and the expression of the general willingness to make my last days as pleasant as could be. Thank God for such a Church! And I thank God for such a method of retiring the general superintendents of the Church. While I am on my feet I want to say that I am not conscious of any degree of mental decay or that I require the sympathy of anybody for any sentiment which I may utter which seems to be in conflict with their views of propriety or truth. I have heard it said here and there: "He is one of our old men." Is he? Well, he is responsible for what he says—responsible to God and responsible, so far as conscience is responsible, to the Church, and responsible in the presence of any man who disagrees with him in his utterance. I will agree to disagree with absolute magnanimity, but, brethren, because a man is retired as a bishop, don't you fancy that God has retired him from a sense of his own responsibility in a matter committed to him by his Church after his retirement? Let us look each other in the face and remember this—that a call to preach does not last forever. The people have a suspicion that a man should retire long before he may be conscious of it; and the Church may have justification to believe that a man, so far as his present efficiency or promise of future effectiveness is concerned, has reached the age of superannuation in the interest of the work which he was elected to promote and advance. Verily the rules which men find applicable—I mean the rules which have their foundation in the purpose for which men are brought into responsible leadership, the rules which the world has found applica-

ble in its own affairs—cannot be lightly passed by the Church in response to the workings of any personal admiration or extravagant appreciation of what a man has done. I have found the Church generous in appreciation. Sometimes, brethren, I read the papers, and I smile when I personally know the dimensions of the matter for which I have received great praise. I know how little I had to do with it. And when I read of some of these tremendous revivals and all that, and I know the mechanism by which the results were produced, I deprecate the lack of honesty at the bottom of all the reporting. O that the Church might be honest! that men might be honest with the Church and with themselves and with God! I thank you for giving me opportunity for saying just this much in the interest of an honorable and just and fair, as between bishops and between bishops and their ministers—honorable, just, and fair method of retiring even general superintendents.

H. N. White: I desire to say simply this, lest members of this Commission might be too much influenced by the analogy that has been drawn to courts. While, as Judge Rogers has said, many State constitutions provide for the retirement of judges at a certain age limit, the greatest system in our country, the Federal courts, have no such provision, but have a provision that judges may retire at a given age if they choose to exercise the right of retirement. The privilege seems to be provided in favor of the judge rather than in favor of the government or the people. I rather take the view that Bishop Denny has expressed—that age is really no criterion of efficiency. In my own United States Circuit Court of Appeals, the Fifth Circuit, I think the oldest judge is regarded as one of the most efficient in the United States. I am satisfied that some judges ought to be retired before they ever get on the bench, and others perhaps, like Judge Rogers himself, ought to reach the green old age of ninety or upward before they think of retirement. I have no definite ideas on this matter. I simply make these remarks because I do not think this body should be influenced by an analogy of courts. If they are to be influenced by any analogy, it should be by that of our greatest system of courts, which has to deal more largely with constitutional questions and property rights than anything else.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Some of the gentlemen have slipped up to me and said they would move to enforce the five-minute rule if I didn't do it without a motion.

Several voices: But the rule is ten minutes.

E. C. Reeves: Dr. Downey said the question should be the doing of the most good for the greatest number of people. General results are made up of concrete cases. One was given

by Dr. Thomas in our Church. It would have been a positive calamity to our Church to have removed Bishop Wilson at the age of seventy. We know that I would not have to go out of this city, nor would I have to go out of this Commission, to find one who has been retired by the age limit who is younger at over seventy than some bishops I have seen in our Church at the age of sixty-five. Now, if it is to be the most good to the most people, when you have an efficient man in there as bishop, and that is doing the most good for the greatest number of people, keep him in there while he is efficient. When he becomes deficient, we have a committee in our General Conference on episcopacy that will report the facts in the case; and if he is inefficient and they say so, he can be retired. I care not for the purpose of this argument what any bishop may think who is retired in this manner. We are looking to the public—what will result in the most good to the greatest number of people and, so long as he is efficient, keep him in there. Do your plain duty, and if he is efficient say so. Let the General Conference say so and retire him. True, it may hurt his feelings; but we may get some one in his place who is more efficient, and no harm will be done. We haven't been unjust to him, and we have been just to the public; and we would have been unjust to the public in keeping such a man in there. If we have a unified Church and we have some bishops above seventy that are efficient, I shall protest against their removal, for I would not think it was for the good of the masses.

P. D. Maddin: I think, in the interest of the bishops themselves and for their protection, there should be a fixed age limit at which they automatically retire. Reference was made to Bishop Wilson, of our Church. I gladly concede that he is one of the greatest men of the Church, but I am sorry to say I witnessed a pitiful spectacle of seeing him tried on a question of mental efficiency and turned down by the General Conference. I hope I shall never see that again with any such man as Bishop Wilson. The system in your Church that at a certain age the bishop automatically ceases to hold Conferences is very much better. How infinitely better it would have been for Bishop Wilson, if he had been retired by an age limit and was still able to give wise counsel for years before his death, than to attempt to go along and hold Conferences long before he was retired when he was unable to go down and hold those Conferences without assistance! I want to see the time when at a certain age the bishops will automatically retire and assume the relations for our Church that the two retired bishops in the Northern Church now hold. I believe the fact that Bishop Wilson was forcibly retired by the General Conference killed him. He

could not stand the shock of it. If he had been retired at a certain age, possibly now he would be giving us the benefit of his great wisdom in the councils of the Church. Now, about the analogy to the courts. At a certain age in the Federal Courts the judges have the privilege of retiring on full pay. Most of them voluntarily retire. As for those who do not, the country would be better off, as an average, if they did retire. I believe most lawyers who have been in the Supreme Court of the United States would agree with me that it would have been better if Chief Justice Fuller had voluntarily retired at the age limit, for after that his sense of hearing was greatly weakened; and I have sat in the Supreme Court when he would give directions when he could not be heard as far off as we are from Judge Reeves now. Manifestly before that stage was reached it would have been better for him to retire. When I vote for the age limit, I feel that I am giving all bishops a privilege to retire at that age without forcibly retiring them.

A. F. Watkins: It is evident that the rule adopted in the Methodist Episcopal Church is working happily, because we have no testimony to the contrary. If the testimony is all to that effect, I believe that it is well, because I believe it is in line with the tendency of the time. I believe that the same rule that would make for the retirement of other public officials—when an age has been reached that has been fixed upon—is calculated to serve most of the interests involved. I believe it would be very well for the Methodist Episcopal Church South, if we had set an age limit. Some one mentioned superannuation of itinerant preachers. I am sure one of the most delicate propositions we have is the retirement of our old men in the itinerary. I have not been in the itinerary thirty-five years without seeing a time when some old man should have been retired, and yet, because of his prestige and because of his influence, based upon his past life, he has been able to stave off the superannuation, and the Church has suffered. I do not suppose very often preachers are superannuated with their consent, and I believe the same thing would apply to our bishops. I believe ordinarily that at least a quadrennium and oftentimes two quadrenniums after it has been evident that a man should retire, through love, reënforced by the zeal of his friends and by his own prestige, he has been kept in the so-called efficient rank when he should have been retired.

F. M. Thomas: May I ask the gentleman a question?

A. F. Watkins: Certainly.

F. M. Thomas: Do you believe the same thing should be applied to traveling ministers?

A. F. Watkins: What I said looks in that direction, but it is

not germane to my argument that I believe in the forcible superannuation of our pastors at a certain age limit; but I have referred to it because it illustrates the fact that a man has to be superannuated. He does not superannuate himself, and all of us have known of cases where old men have been forcibly set aside; and in almost every instance, as far as I have observed, the setting aside has been years after the man really ought to have been set aside by his brethren of the Conference. I believe, as Brother Downey has well said, that we are not here to legislate for the exceptional cases, but for the average man; and we are here not to legislate that we may divest ourselves of the useful work of these old men, but that we may take them out of the administrative work and leave them in the councils. And I believe that is best for the Church.

T. N. Ivey: There is a special reason why I desire to place myself publicly on record as favoring this plan of automatically retiring a bishop at a certain age. My observation has been to the effect that even in our Southern Methodism we could have saved much if this rule had been in effect. At the same time I can place my hand on special cases in which it can be clearly seen that men over seventy years of age have been a great blessing to our Church. Yet it is to be emphasized that the principle to be observed is that legislation must be for the average man and not for the exceptional man. I shall be glad to vote for this provision.

C. M. Bishop: I move the previous question on this matter.

The motion was seconded, and, being put to a vote, the main question was ordered.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion of Mr. Simpson is before the house.

Bishop Mouzon: My substitute for the Committee's report was before the house, and it is moved to divide the two questions. At no time did I withdraw my substitute. That was before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Will you read the substitute?

Bishop Mouzon: I shall be happy to. The substitute refers the whole matter of superannuation to the General Conference; and the General Conference is to decide whether the bishop is to be superannuated, and we are not deciding that here. Here is the way it reads: "And provided, further, that nothing herein shall preclude the General Conference from adopting rules and regulations in relation to a uniform age limit for the retirement of bishops." So that it is not settled here, even, but the whole matter is passed to the General Conference to be determined there.

Secretary Thomas: Here is the motion we acted upon:

"Moved that the question of superannuation of bishops at a certain age shall be decided before taking up the other matters."

Henry Wade Rogers: What was my amendment?

Secretary Thomas: "Moved that we insert in the provision not merely that the General Conference shall have the right to retire, but that when a bishop reaches a certain age he shall be automatically retired.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: We are going to decide the principle on the vote now taken. We will decide whether we agree that there should be an age at which the bishop is to be superannuated, and then the question comes up on the form of the expression, as suggested by Bishop Mouzon and Judge Rogers.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question is—

Bishop Mouzon: I rise to a point of order. Upon questions of law I should defer to these distinguished jurists, but I maintain that there is nothing before us except the division of the substitute which I offered and that the vote must come on the second half of it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair does not think the point well taken. The question is on the simple question of whether or not we agree that there should be an age at which bishops should be superannuated.

T. D. Samford: Then if we vote for this, do we recommend an age limit to be put into the Constitution?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Recommend that it be put in.

T. D. Samford: Suppose some one doesn't want to do that?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Then the way not to do it is not to vote for it.

T. D. Samford: Then I shall not vote. I am not in favor of it.

Bishop Mouzon: What became of my substitute?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): It is waiting on this.

Bishop Mouzon: On what principle of parliamentary procedure?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I think it was unanimously agreed to that we must take the vote in that way.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That does not decide anything except the principle, and then we will decide afterwards where to put it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question is whether you do or do not favor the principle of an age limit. Upon that the previous question was ordered. If you favor the principle of an age limit, raise your hand. Those contrary will raise their hands. And the principle is agreed to by a major-

ity. Now, Mr. Secretary, give us the next motion. We have ordered the previous question, and we cannot do anything now but vote and raise points of order.

Bishop Cooke: Can I not submit an amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): No. The previous question has been ordered, and the Secretary will report the substitute of Bishop Mouzon. Bishop Mouzon's amendment is: "Provided, that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed; and provided, further, that nothing herein shall preclude the General Conference from adopting rules and regulations to a uniform age limit for the superannuation of bishops."

Bishop Candler: That proposition is the next question.

David G. Downey: I would like to have the motion for which that is substituted.

Alexander Simpson, Jr. (reading): "The General Conference shall have power by general rules to superannuate bishops upon reaching a determined age."

Henry Wade Rogers: What has been the necessity for that provision in view of the provision that we have voted that there should be inserted in this Constitution a certain age which we ourselves are to fix?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The vote is upon Bishop Mouzon's substitute.

A voice: Is it clear to the minds of the members that we are voting simply on the latter part of Bishop Mouzon's amendment and not upon the whole of it?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): On the whole of it.

Edgar Blake: No.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Is it only the second part? Very well.

Henry Wade Rogers: I should still insist that we have voted and recognized the principle to be inserted in this Constitution.

Voces: No, not in this Constitution.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The vote now is upon the latter part of the resolution of Bishop Mouzon.

Bishop Mouzon: And the latter part of it reads: "Provided, further, that nothing herein shall preclude the General Conference from adopting rules and regulations in relation to a uniform age limit for the superannuation of bishops."

Bishop Cooke: We are not ready on that.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You have ordered the previous question.

Bishop Cooke: I know it; but I want the reading of the entire matter before us, in order to know whether this is a

376 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

substitute. A declaration of what we have had is one thing, and the record is another.

David G. Downey: A point of order. You cannot have a substitute for something that has passed.

Bishop Cooke: We haven't passed it.

David G. Downey: Yes, we have.

Bishop Cooke: That is what you claim.

David G. Downey: We have passed that, have we not, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Yes.

David G. Downey: You cannot have a substitute for something that is passed.

F. M. Thomas (Secretary): The matter is very clear. We first decided the principle; and then the report of the subcommittee comes up, and Bishop Mouzon moves to substitute for that the matter which has just been read before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That is exactly it; and if any of you are absurd, let the Chairman say that it is impossible for the Chairman to keep some of the house from being absurd at times.

A vote was taken on Bishop Mouzon's substitute.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The noes appear to have it—the noes have it.

A division was called for.

Bishop McDowell: A division is called for.

Bishop Mouzon: Some of us do not know where we are. Pardon me for explaining just exactly where we are. The Committee brought in a report. I brought in a substitute. One of our distinguished jurists moved that the question of the age limit should be first taken up. The Chair then said that in substance he moved to divide the question, and the question was divided; and we took up the latter part of it and then voted on something else.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We are now on the first part of Bishop Mouzon's resolution—no, on the second part, which was just rejected, and you are now on the first part.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Then the question is on adopting the Committee's report. There was here before us the report of the Committee on a given subject. A substitute was offered by Bishop Mouzon, and that substitute was rejected by the Commission; and that leaves us in the position, then, of voting upon the original motion upon that subject—namely, the report of the Committee, which says: "The General Conference shall have power by general rules to superannuate them upon reaching a certain age." That is before us now.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair thinks the

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 377

point not well taken. The second might depend on the first. It might be determined by what is done on the first.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The gentleman appeals from the decision of the Chair. All those in favor of sustaining the Chair will hold up their hands, and those contrary hold up their hands; and the appeal is sustained.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The question is on the one question: "The General Conference shall have power by general rules to superannuate bishops upon reaching a determined age."

The Chairman: The motion is to adopt that, and there is an amendment by Judge Rogers to insert not merely that the General Conference shall have the right to retire the bishops at a determined age, but that when a bishop reaches an age to be determined later he shall be automatically retired.

Henry Wade Rogers: That is a substitute for the provision.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question is on the amendment of Judge Rogers.

A vote being taken, the amendment was lost.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Now the question is on the adoption of the report of the committee.

F. M. Thomas: I have an amendment to add the words "for causes herein provided for."

A vote being taken, the report of the Committee was agreed to.

Edwin M. Randall: Are we going to take up that part of the Committee's report upon which we have not voted?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Yes.

Bishop Mouzon: I would still like to inquire what became of my substitute. What became of the first part that was never voted on?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That will be up now.

John M. Moore: I would like to have that paper read, and then I want to offer an amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): What paper?

John M. Moore: The report of the Committee on the point now before us.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: As I view it now, the matter before us is the substitute of Bishop Mouzon for the report of the committee. The report of the Committee reads:

The General Conference shall have power, by three-fourths vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting, to retire them from further effective service in the episcopacy.

Bishop Mouzon: If you will permit me, I will read that part

378 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

of my substitute which survives: "Provided that no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed." That leaves out that three-fourths vote of the General Conference which would make the retirement of a bishop practically impossible. The whole section then will read: "To fix the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences and to retire the same, provided no bishop could be retired without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed."

John M. Moore: I move that the words "two-thirds" be substituted for "three-fourths" in the original report, so that it will read "by a two-thirds vote" instead of "by a three-fourths vote."

Bishop Mouzon: I rise to a point of order. The substitute is before us, and you cannot amend the other while the substitute is before us; but with the consent of the brother who seconded my substitute I would like to make a slight change so that it would read: "Provided no bishop shall be retired without the concurrence by a two-thirds vote of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed."

John M. Moore: I want to ask that my amendment be acted upon in its order, and I trust that can be done.

Edgar Blake: I want to call attention to one or two things that I think bear upon the motion offered by Bishop Mouzon. He provides that a bishop cannot be retired unless by a two-thirds vote of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed.

Bishop Mouzon: That suggestion of mine was not accepted by my second, and my substitute stands just as if did originally.

Edgar Blake: That doesn't affect the principle. It only affects the figures. Bishop Mouzon provides that a bishop shall not be retired without the consent of a majority of the Regional Conference in which he resides. I want to make two suggestions with reference to that. A bishop's services are not limited to the jurisdiction in which he resides, for we have provided that the general superintendent may assign a bishop at any Annual Conference in any jurisdiction for the purpose of residential supervision. That fact would seem to indicate with great clearness that the jurisdiction in which he has his residence is not the only jurisdiction that is affected by his service. And, therefore, that jurisdiction ought not to have the power to estop the action of the General Conference in this matter. There is another matter that I think we should consider that bears upon this under the action proposed in

the substitute offered by Bishop Mouzon. It would require the concurrence of a majority. Is that it, Bishop Mouzon?

Bishop Mouzon: Yes.

Edgar Blake: In other words, in the Regional Conference of one hundred members fifty-one men could prevent the retirement of a bishop that two-thirds or three-fourths of the General Conference might desire to retire. I don't believe we want to put so great a power into the hands of such a small number of men, and for that reason I am against the substitute.

H. M. Du Bose: There is yet a broader question which we are in danger of overlooking. All of our provisions and all of our propositions for this constitution look to the emphasizing of the episcopacy as far as we may in the reorganization of the Church. It is sufficient protection to the Regional Conference that it should make provision for selecting for its own service and for administration within its boundaries of the man it prefers, but by the provision of this act just passed there is put into the hands of the General Conference a prerogative of establishing a rule by which they may be automatically retired. It would be a discrimination against the powers of the General Conference and a limitation of this Constitution that we have in the connectional affairs of the episcopacy to look at this still more important power. I apprehend that we shall have preserved to us something like the order we have now in our General Conference dealing with bishops—reviewing their work and reporting upon their efficiency through the Committee on Episcopacy. Moreover, the Regional Conference will be present; it will be largely in the Committee on Efficiency; the Regional Conference will be represented in the General Conference—possibly will be one-sixth of the body. There will be all needed possibility for the jurisdiction to attend to the case there and make the bishop retire or protect him against an unjust retirement; so that the matter of leaving the sentiment—for that is what it amounts to—to the Jurisdictional Conference. We will make the whole process regular by passing this recommendation of the Committee. As a member of that Committee I had objection to only one feature of it, and that was the large designation in the number of fractional votes required—three-fourths—which I thought was too large. I wanted to change that at the proper juncture, reducing it to a less figure. A good deal has been said about the record made in the past, particularly the record in 1844. For one, at least, as a member of this Commission and as a prospective minister in the unified Church, my vision is forward, not backward. I am looking to the future and not to the memorials of the past. In time

we shall have no such condition in the unified Church. In the near future—in fact, I do not think in my life I shall see any such condition as was then. I think we should base our view of the situation not from the past, but to the future. It is that large confidence which the present advances and the future suggests that I think should be the spirit with which we should enter into this arrangement. I repeat again what I said, recalling that Jeffersonian motto: "Trust me all in all or not at all." Unless we can settle this looking to the future and not to the past, I think we shall enter upon the policy of reaction and not of progress. I have spoken very seldom in the Commission, and I do so now only out of a profound conviction of what should guide us.

Bishop Leete: I have no question at all that when we get through with this there will have to be a coördination or a codification of the very things we have actually passed. Nevertheless, it seems to me wise to avoid confusion at every stage possible during the discussion. I am glad personally that a majority of these two Commissions have confirmed the principle of retiring on an age limit. Personally I would rather look forward to the day of relief from irksome work in my old age, whether well or unwell. I would be glad to look forward to a time when I might sit apart from the straining duty and put my work in general councils. I would rather look forward to such a period as that than to have a committee coming around once every two or four years and feeling my legs and sounding my wind. It is delightful to think that you are safe as long as you keep the peace and conduct yourself according to the laws of Christianity. But what I think now is this: We are in danger right at this point of passing legislation in exact conflict with the legislation we have just enacted. It seems to me that you are about to provide for a limited retirement, and you are putting into the hands of the Regional Conference the power to prevent such retirement if it decides to do so by a vote of a bare majority unless your purpose is to provide for the interim between the establishment of the unified Church and the first General Conference. Let us not pass absolutely inconsistent legislation. If this is to remain after the action just taken, it should be corrected to specify that the purport of it is to take care of the period between the unifying of the Church and the time when the General Conference can provide a time for retirement. If that kind of a provision could be put in it, I shall be delighted to vote for Dr. Mouzon's substitute; but if it stands as it is now, you are passing conflicting statutes.

Bishop Mouzon: Bishop Leete is making "retire" and "superannuate" mean one and the same thing according to the

present usage in the Methodist Episcopal Church; but that is not the meaning of "retire" in our Church. "Retire" does not necessarily mean "superannuate."

E. B. Chappell: I should like to amend Bishop Mouzon's substitute so as to make it read thus: "Provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed." The reason I offer that substitute is this: If the Regional Conference wanted to retire and the General Conference wanted to retire, and the Regional Conference concurred, the Regional Conference and the General Conference might still retire a bishop; but if the Regional Conference objected, it would require a two-thirds vote to overcome that objection on the part of the Regional Conference. I believe that would sufficiently safeguard the matter.

Bishop McDowell: A majority vote of both concurring would do it, but the General Conference by a two-thirds vote would retire, even though the Regional Conference objected to the retirement.

E. B. Chappell: Yes.

Bishop Leete: If Bishop Mouzon's definitions of "retire" and "superannuate" were put in, it would be clear.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Did the motion of Dr. Chappell find a second?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I second that.

J. H. Reynolds: The substitute offered by Bishop Mouzon is submitted as a means of protecting and safeguarding the bishop. I oppose it because I believe it imperils both the dignity and the stability of the bishop.

Bishop Mouzon: Just a question of personal privilege. Permit me to say to Brother Reynolds that he has misunderstood the meaning of this. It is not submitted as a means of protecting the bishops at all. I put the Church before any officer of the Church. It is submitted in order to protect the Church and the region from which the bishop comes, not the bishop.

J. H. Reynolds: I will withdraw that remark, then. I now come to this point: that I believe, instead of protecting against a majority in the General Conference, it will imperil both the dignity and the stability of the bishops, because I fancy I see growing up the custom that you are first to take the consensus of opinion of the Regional Conference on the question of retirement; and when the Regional Conference gets to the General Conference, it will adopt its findings as a matter of course. Hence I think, instead of fifty-one in the Regional Conference of one hundred preventing the wishes of the two-thirds of the General Conference in retiring, a vote of fifty-one in the Regional Conference of one hundred would practically retire the

bishop; and a bishop might easily have antagonism in the Regional Conference that would produce that kind of a vote. I therefore think we had better leave the matter entirely to the General Conference, merely agreeing upon the vote required for the General Conference to pass it.

W. N. Ainsworth: We have already provided that a bishop shall become a bishop of the entire Church, notwithstanding the section or region from which he comes. Since he now by our action becomes a bishop of the whole Church, the whole Church ought to pass upon the matter of his retirement. We have previously provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote of the General Conference to prevent the consecration of a bishop passed up to it from the sectional area. It is perfectly logical and in keeping with that previous provision for us now simply to say that it shall require a two-thirds vote of the General Conference to retire a bishop from his episcopal administration; and I think, in order to keep these two acts logical and in proper relation to each other, that should be our action at this point.

A. J. Lamar: I want to say, in regard to the Committee's report, that I deem it very important that the General Conference or any other body shall not be given *carte blanche* to deal with the question of retirement of a bishop. I am not speaking of the superannuation of a bishop, but of retirement. I would like, therefore, if the Committee could see its way clear to do it—I hope they will accept the amendment that you put in there for inefficiency or unacceptability. My reason for suggesting those two words is that they are familiar to our part of the Church, which is because we use them in dealing with the question of the vacation or the location of an itinerant preacher. We can't vacate him without inefficiency or unacceptability. I think those words are broad enough to cover any case where the General Conference would be justified in retiring a bishop. What do think of that, Mr. Simpson?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: This Committee is in an odd sort of a situation. We had a long meeting Saturday night, in which Mr. Samford insisted on the amendment of Dr. Mouzon and Dr. Goucher disagreed with that. I was Secretary and was silent; and finally the Committee agreed unanimously to substitute "three-fourths" for "two-thirds," which was the original resolution offered by Dr. Ainsworth, in order to reach a settlement of the matter unanimously. Since we came in here this morning Mr. Samford has changed his mind, as he had a right do, and Dr. Du Bose has changed his mind to get back to the two-thirds, and we have a special committee of four in which two out of the four did not agree.

H. M. Du Bose: We reserved that right.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: We always did.

H. M. Du Bose: And that was my original position.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: And so it was Mr. Samford's position.

T. D. Samford: If I had taken any position before this Commission, I was not aware of it.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: It was not loud enough to be heard by the whole body, but all those on this side heard it.

T. D. Samford: Perhaps I thought out loud.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: So I now feel free from the action of the Committee; and my position is that I prefer Dr. Chappell's amendment to any of the others, and I never heard it until a moment ago. Inserting Dr. Lamar's "unacceptability" is not needed to cover everything. The general rule has been in all affairs of life, I think, that you may look forward to all the things which may arise in the future. You have to put your trust somewhere. There is no possibility, as I view it, that you could put your trust, as Dr. Ainsworth says, anywhere save in the General Conference. If you leave it to the General Conference to say whether the circumstances are such as that for the good of the Church that bishop should be retired from effective work, you leave it there just as effectively without putting in "unacceptability" as by putting it in. The "unacceptability" adds nothing to it, and I see no reason for adding it. I am speaking for myself against possibly a difference judgment of the rest of the Committee.

A. J. Lamar: My question was asked in the interest of saving time. I thought they might accept the amendment.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: For myself I would accept it, though I do not think it helps it in any way; but I prefer Dr. Chappell's amendment to anything before us.

A. J. Lamar: At the proper time I shall introduce that amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): If I heard the two motions, one by Bishop Mouzon and one by Dr. Chappell, correctly, Bishop Mouzon's is a substitute for the Committee's report, and Dr. Chappell's is a substitute for Bishop Mouzon's and could not be entertained as such. You can vote down Bishop Mouzon's if you prefer Dr. Chappell's, but there is no way of making a clear record except first to vote on Bishop Mouzon's and the succeeding vote to be determined by the result of that vote. The vote will now be on the adoption of Bishop Mouzon's substitute.

A vote being taken, the substitute was lost.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Chappell's motion can now come up if he so desires.

E. B. Chappell: I offer my substitute.

Several seconded the substitute.

384 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

John M. Moore: I want that two-thirds put in. Will you allow me to move the insertion of two-thirds instead of three-fourths in the original?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You can make that motion. The Secretary will read Dr. Chappell's amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows: "Provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed."

Edgar Blake: The report of the Committee provides that a bishop can be retired only by a three-fourths vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting. In the election of a bishop, to come back to our Regional Conference proposition again, 51 members can elect, and one-third in the General Conference of eight hundred can confirm—that is, 234 members would be sufficient to confirm. Now, a bishop that we could elect by only 51 votes and that we could confirm by only 231 votes we propose according to the Committee report to require 600 votes to retire. I do not believe that is the proper proportion, and for that reason I offer the motion made by Dr. Moore, although I prefer Dr. Chappell's form providing for the retirement by two-thirds. As a matter of fact, I would prefer a majority, but it seems that we can compromise on two-thirds.

Bishop Cranston: Brethren, you can never secure a majority of a General Conference for the retirement of a bishop whose services were desired to be continued by the region in which he is registered. You are perfectly safe with a majority or with two-thirds, either one.

Bishop Denny: Before we vote I want to know from the Chairman if we are left free to do anything we want with that word "retire."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I think so. You can define it as you like.

A vote being taken, Dr. Chappell's substitute was agreed to.

F. M. Thomas: I move to amend the report by adding after the word "retire" the words "for causes hereinafter provided for." I do not think it wise in this present clause to specify, but there ought to be somewhere in the Constitution under the provision with reference to bishops a specification as to what a bishop may be retired for. I do not think it is wise or right to lodge with any body the power to retire a man except for a cause, and that cause should be provided for; if he be guilty of immoral derelictions, let them be tried for them—face the issue. Let it be squarely set forth, but I think the history of the General Conference will bear me out in the statement that there are times when the General Conference is not competent to pass upon the general question of the retirement of a bishop. I am

going to make a statement with which some of you may not agree. It is not to raise or to revive any old history. I have read very carefully and closely from the standpoint of moral psychology or Christian sanity the debate on both sides in the General Conference of 1844, and I have reached the conclusion that there were only about two men in that body, one from the South and one from the North, who at all times manifested throughout that session a sweet, reasonable Christian spirit.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Don't name them.

F. M. Thomas: I am not going to. The point is this: you have already decided to retire a man when he reaches an age limit, which I think is a supreme injustice. My good friend, whom I esteem very highly, Bishop Leete, spoke very longingly of the joys of being released from the duties of the episcopacy so as to have a wider range of usefulness. It reminds me of what a very prominent man once said, that the best position in the Church was that of a superannuated bishop if he could just get there without being elected bishop. I fear we are creating too much of a longing for those pastures green and fields that are inviting.

Bishop Leete: May I interrupt?

F. M. Thomas: Certainly.

Bishop Leete: Much as I admire the argument the gentleman is making, and much as I sympathize with his desires that a bishop should not long for ease or pleasure, what I said was not that the bishop should be released from the duties of the episcopacy, but from those duties of the episcopal office which are more largely secular, so that he could spend the time at the end in the higher matters of episcopacy.

F. M. Thomas: I am frank to say that I am Methodist born and Methodist bred and expect to be a Methodist until I die; but when I entered the itinerancy, if I had known that the day would come in my Conference when my Conference would superannuate me upon an age limit without regard to my effectiveness as a traveling minister, I could not have conscientiously entered that body, because it is violative of my deepest conception of life. The point I am trying to make is: you are putting an arbitrary law as to an age limit, and you are giving power to the General Conference to retire without regard to the principle of the retirement involved, and I think that ought to be fixed, and a man ought to be protected. If he is to be retired, he should be retired for inefficiency or unacceptability, and that ought to be said. If he is going to be retired for some moral dereliction, let him be tried.

E. B. Chappell: I second the motion.

Bishop Cooke: I offer the following substitute for that for the reason that I judge we shall see it will be impossible to

enumerate all the causes for which a bishop may be retired, and therefore legally, by every law of interpretation, everything which is not mentioned is excluded. I think that is a legal principle. Is it not, Brother Simpson?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That is a settled legal principle.

Bishop Cooke: For that reason I present this amendment: "Provided that a bishop shall not be retired without specific reasons"—I do not enumerate them—"having been formally presented and sufficient consideration given to the same." We all understand the history underlying the reference that Dr. Thomas makes and the two theories of the episcopacy which confronted the fathers of 1844. There was the purely Presbyterian or moderated theory which those present declared had never been the doctrine of Methodism on the episcopacy. The idea that by a wave of the hand you could dispense the entire episcopacy and elect a new body, provided you didn't do away with the episcopacy, was held by a number and strongly objected to by a great many others who were thoroughly versed in our Methodist history. This will prevent any stampeding of the General Conference and wiping a man out of his office by a mere waving of a hand and thereby putting him in a rather ambiguous position before the public at large and also his own Church.

T. D. Samford: How would it do to specify the reasons? "Provided that a bishop shall not be retired without specific reasons (and specify them) and judicial consideration given."

Bishop McDowell: Will not the use of the word "judicial" give rise to a question as to whether that consideration would not inevitably have to go to the judicial council.

Bishop Cooke: What is intended by "judicial" here is not that it go to the Judicial Council or the Judicial Committee, but to the Episcopal Committee, and what is meant by "judicial" is that those reasons shall have due and weighty consideration. It doesn't mean anything other than that: that they shall be properly weighed to see if they are sufficient. If the bishop renders himself somewhat obnoxious here and there so that you cannot tell whether he is an advance agent of a vaudeville troupe or a minister of Jesus Christ, he could be tried and removed. A great many charges can be brought, but only those that are worthy of consideration should be given consideration.

Bishop Cranston: All consideration given by the General Conference to such a case would be in places informal. Wouldn't you accept "without sufficient cause and without adequate representation of his case."

Bishop Cooke: I certainly would accept that.

W. N. Ainsworth: I would like to have Dr. Thomas read his amendment.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 387

The amendment was read, as follows: "Add after the word 'retire' 'for causes hereinafter provided for.'"

W. N. Ainsworth: I move to substitute this phrase—

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): There is a substitute of Bishop Cooke pending.

W. N. Ainsworth: Was that a substitute for Dr. Thomas's amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Yes.

W. N. Ainsworth: I would give notice that when that is disposed of I will propose this substitute, "for infirmity or inefficiency."

F. M. Thomas: I will accept that and let that go before the house.

Bishop Cooke: I will accept the amendment suggested by Bishop Cranston: "Provided that a bishop shall not be retired without specific reasons having been formally presented and adequate representation of his case." Of course in the matter of the efficiency, right there is the kernel of the whole thing—"for infirmity and inefficiency." That is a broad term, and the whole itinerant idea might be involved.

A. J. Lamar: I would prefer the words I suggested awhile ago, "unacceptability and inefficiency." If a man has infirmities, they render him inefficient. It is not necessary to say that, but there may be a case where a man is an efficient man and yet has such angles to him that he becomes absolutely unacceptable to the Church. I think the words I suggest as used in our Church applicable to itinerant preachers cover the ground. So I move to amend—

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You had better give notice that you will offer that when these things are disposed of.

Bishop Cooke: I catch your thought, but those are such broad terms, and so many things are included under those terms that I think it had better be left until the time shall come when his retirement is before the body. If we say "for specific reasons," those reasons would include inefficiency or unacceptability or something of the kind; but the man may be really acceptable in many ways and very efficient in many ways, but he may have mannerisms that render him unacceptable. There may be a failure to represent the soberness and the seriousness of a minister of the gospel by his speech. There are a thousand things that might render a preacher unacceptable. Now, if we say "specific reasons." If you say "inefficient," you would have to gather many things to show the inefficiency; but if you have "for specific reasons" that he fails to measure up to the ideals of the Church, for every bishop does represent the best ideals or ought to of the best people of the Church, and he ought never to forget who he is or what he is, no matter in what company he is. I

would judge that everything there can be included here under the terms "specific reasons."

Frank Neff: I think I see the thing pretty clearly. You are not gaining anything by the word "efficiency." Any General Conference that will be mean enough to take advantage of a bishop under the word "retirement" and do the unjust thing can squirm around and hide behind all these provisions in this proposed amendment. I think you had better leave out the "retire."

Edgar Blake: I think there is a rather serious objection to the form in which Bishop Cooke brings in his motion. As I understand his motion, it would require charges and specifications to be made. We will have to hear the specified reasons. I don't see how it can be otherwise. I may be mistaken.

Bishop Cooke: I think there is a great difference in our Church between preferring charges and complaints. When you present charges you must enumerate and go through a formal process, but when a case is brought up in Quarterly Conference and all are asked are there any complaints, you do not make formal charges and go through a process of judicial trial. There is a good deal of difference between complaints and charges, as all well remember.

Edgar Blake: Regardless of the statements which Bishop Cooke has just made, it does not seem clear about the matter at all. The matter has to be interpreted by the language of his resolution and not by what he says. I understand the resolution reads "for specified reasons."

Bishop Cooke: "Specific reasons."

Edgar Blake: That is, reasons specifically stated and formally preferred. I can readily see the reason why there should be in those matters in which imprudent talk or violation of morals are concerned—questions that involve a man's character—I can readily understand where formal charges and specifications should be made and a trial had by due process of law to give the man a chance to vindicate himself. But when you come to the matter of the retirement of a bishop, I have not had very much experience, but I have been in three General Conferences where there were general requirements, and we have found when those matters came up that there were three reasons for retirement: (1) Physical limitations or infirmities; (2) mental infirmities; (3) temperamental infirmities. And you can hardly prefer charges and specifications on either one of those things.

Bishop Cooke: Haven't you just specified?

Edgar Blake: Yes, but you are saying in the case of an individual bishop there shall be alleged against him in due form specific reasons.

Bishop Cooke: Well, haven't you done it?

Edgar Blake: No, sir.

Bishop Cooke: When you say "Temperamental" is not that a specific reason?

Edgar Blake: Let me show how it was done. Take the General Conference of 1904. There were five bishops retired. First the Committee on Episcopacy appointed a small committee to consider the matter of the effectiveness of the particular bishop. That committee made an investigation and, after making the investigation, brought in a report recommending the retirement of four of the bishops, but they did not recommend the retirement of either one of those four bishops until the committee had had those four bishops before the committee and gone over the matter after the special committee made the report to the entire committee, then the bishops who had been recommended for retirement were invited to come before this episcopacy and make such statements as they cared to make, and in each instance the bishop came before the body and made a statement.

W. N. Ainsworth: That rule prevails also with us.

Edgar Blake: Yes. In fact, one of the bishops was before us three times—once at our invitation and twice of his own initiative. At Los Angeles, when we came to the discussion of the cases of various bishops, it was very clear from the discussion in the entire committee that there was a strong sentiment in favor of the retirement of a certain bishop who had not been recommended for retirement by the subcommittee. It was so clear that there was a strong sentiment that was likely to prove the sentiment of the majority that we found ourselves in a very embarrassing situation. We faced the probability of recommending the retirement of a bishop who had not been heard by the committee itself, and so this action was taken in his case. It was provided in the event a majority of the Committee on Episcopacy should recommend the retirement of that bishop the action in his case should be considered only as tentative, that the bishop should be informed of the action of the committee and should be given an opportunity to be heard by the Committee. It proved, when a vote was taken, that a majority of two-thirds had voted in favor of the man's retirement, but in his case that was considered simply as a tentative recommendation on the part of the committee. He was informed the next morning by the chairman of the committee of what had been done, and he was invited to come before the committee and came and made a statement of considerable length, made as complete a statement as he cared to make; and then, without any further consideration of his case, the committee voted by more than two-thirds recommending his retirement, and the action was confirmed by the General Conference. In these cases of mental infirmity and physical infirmity and temperamental infirmity I don't think any

bishop under such circumstances should be put on trial. I think it would be unjust.

Bishop Cooke: I protest against reading into this amendment such an intention. There is no such intention. We all know there is a wide difference between charges and complaints. A man is complained of for this, that, or the other reason, but he is not on trial on charges.

Bishop Cranston: Lest I be misunderstood, I would like to disclaim having made reference to the instance Dr. Blake refers to. The instance I had in mind was the vote of disapproval of the administration of Bishop Walden without giving him a chance to be heard. That occurred at Chicago.

Edgar Blake: And the question of Bishop Walden's retirement was not involved.

Bishop Cranston: No, it was not a matter of retirement.

Bishop Cooke: As a matter of personal privilege I rise to protest against the misrepresentation of my amendment.

Edgar Blake: I understand the bishop to object to my reading into that that which I want to get out of it. I have no desire to get out of it anything more than was in the mind of Bishop Cooke. If I have been able to get out of his mind more than his mind contained, I apologize.

Edwin M. Randall: What I desire to say is in reference partly to the matters before us and partly as a matter of privilege concerning the body. I believe with respect to the matters before us that we propose passing a matter that is unnecessary and that will not be effective. I do not believe that it is possible to bind any future Conference by any such action as we are taking. If the Conference is determined on the retirement of a man, it will find a way to do it under anything that we are proposing to enact. However, I wish to say with respect to this and other matters we have been discussing: I am sure we are at a point where we see the tendency to commit an error very common among all bodies that meet for the consideration and creation of constitutional matters. Almost invariably there is a spirit of distrust of future legislative bodies that may be gathered to act under the constitutional provision they are making. Invariably every constitution is made to contain legislative rather than constitutional matter and to tie up future legislative bodies for fear they may act viciously, as if those bodies doing the constitution making had wisdom that future bodies would not possess. I believe we are losing time and losing efficiency by a tendency to go into detail to a degree that will not be promotive of the future welfare of the Church, and I believe this morning that this session has a tendency to differ over small details of things, and the nervousness of this body as shown by the members indicates that our long and late sessions have gotten us into a state of

nervousness where we must be upon our guard against these things, lest we shall spend an amount of time upon details that will force us to adjourn without having all the general principles we ought to consider while we are still in session. I want to add this one statement, that I believe the matter before us both in the amendment and in the substitute is unnecessary, and personally I believe it is better not to pass such a matter running into unnecessary details throughout the remainder of this session.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : The Chair recognizes Brother Fairbanks, who has a matter of privilege.

Charles W. Fairbanks : I crave the indulgence of the Commission only for a few moments. I rise primarily to ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the further meetings of this session, owing to imperative necessity of leaving the city at three o'clock this afternoon. In extending this regret, I wish to congratulate the body upon the great and rapid advances that have been made in the consideration of the important work which has been committed to our hands by our respective sessions. I doubt if in recent times so important a matter as this has advanced so rapidly and so well in the few months which we have been giving to this subject. I do not think that in our more careless moments we appreciate the true magnitude of this work. There never was an occasion in our experience when more vital matters were submitted to the consideration of men. We are in the midst of times which chasten us all. We face a future which some of us, far-seeing in our membership, can see but dimly, if at all, and I hold to the belief that it is our Christian duty to do all that lies within our finite vision to strengthen the foundations of our institutions and equip ourselves for meeting the responsibilities of the days to come to the highest degree. We know not what problems will affect our government to-morrow. We stand amazed at the unfolding of the tragic events of the day. The Methodist Church must play a part, and a great part, in the problems of the future. We cannot separate religion from political events. We cannot separate the questions of the Church and those of the State. I speak in a large way. While Church and State are independent, and we hope in God's providence they will always be separated, yet in the final analysis the republic rests upon the Church. I feel it of the utmost importance. So impressed am I with it that I scarcely trust myself to face the future. But I am so impressed with the sense of concern of what lies beyond the close of this day that I feel a profound anxiety as to the confirmation of this work of this great body. The temper with which these proceedings have passed, the good nature, and the consecration have challenged my admiration. There was in the beginning a vague distrust, a withholding of a

measure of confidence here and there; but those, under the attrition of time and the force of logic, have gradually disappeared, and nothing stands between us in all sincerity, nothing that would defeat the ultimate conclusion. I believe from what I have observed, and more from what I have felt, that success will crown the efforts of this great Commission. Who can tell the far-reaching benefits to be derived from these interchanges of views and these efforts at constructive legislation? We are not rolling on the world, but building upon the world a larger structure. United Methodism in America will mean strength to the republic as well as strength to the Church. I regret my inability to contribute more to the ultimate results. My heart remains with you as I take leave of you. Sitting to-day where acquaintance has ripened into love and respect, I wish I could take with me the assurance that all our hopes will be realized and the hopes of the millions back of us. It is pleasant in going, I may say, to feel assured that the citadels of parliamentary law will be secure against successful assaults in the hands of its ministry. While some of the questions raised have amused the Chair and his friends, and I am one of them, I am charmed by the steady hand of the pilot and the success of the administration of the office of chairman. I know not when we shall meet again, nor do you. We are in the midst of such tragic events in the world that I predict not far into the future or venture to hope too much, but I hope this, Mr. Chairman, that you may accept from me an invitation to resume your labors in the city of Indianapolis. Our doors are wide open. We are easy of access. Whether our recess shall be short or one of several months, my thoughts will be with you all, and my heart will be overflowing with gratitude for your courtesy and kindness.

Bishop Denny: I move that, while we regret the enforced absence of Brother Fairbanks, we grant this request.

Henry Wade Rogers: A question of privilege. I am requested by Brother Brown to inform the Commission that it was absolutely necessary for him to return to St. Louis yesterday afternoon. He found that matters required his presence, and he desired me to expressly regret that he could not say good-by to the members of the Commission, and I am now performing the duties conveyed upon me to give his greetings to the members of the Commission and his regret that he has been compelled to withdraw from the session before its labors were concluded.

A vote being taken, the motion of Bishop Denny was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Chair takes occasion to express personal regret at the retirement of our honored brother. I was about to say that the Chair was somewhat of a disciple in parliamentary procedure of Brother Fairbanks, and perhaps he would be willing for the moment to relieve himself

of his own without confessing Bishop Cranston's sins. I have always observed that in the meetings of public bodies a part of the duties of a chairman is to constitute himself as *amicus curiae* in many matters, and I am that in this case.

Bishop Denny: Every consistent man is necessarily limited by principles he has learned, no matter how he has learned them. In my boyhood I had occasion to give a very careful reading to that great author, Montesquieu, and from him I learned what has been confirmed by all the reading that I have been permitted to do and such narrow observations as I have had. As stated in the language of Montesquieu, the motion of the people is generally either too swift or too slow. Sometimes with thousands of feet they trample all before them, and sometimes with thousands of arms they grope like snails. A student of constitutional history very well knows that those who are making provisions for the future need restrictions. If you start out with entire confidence in the ability as well as in the character of those for whom you are laying down a constitution, you start out for a wreck. I think there can be no question of that, even within the narrow range of my own reading in civics. I also learned when I was a boy a thing that has helped me all my life and that has helped me since I came in here, and I learned that from Edmund Burke. Burke told me long ago that the only ground upon which a man could confidently predict the future was from what he learned from the past. You say those are very large principles to be lodged here in connection with the amendment before us. We have a very large amendment before us. I have had some experience as a member of the General Conference and some experience as a member of the Committee on Episcopacy. I have had occasion to see some of the complaints that have come into the General Conference and been committed to the inspection of the Committee on Episcopacy to see what should be done. I know how they have been practiced. I know how, if they could have gotten a majority from any point of prejudice behind them, they would have closed the career of more than one man. How is any man to know what he is to avoid unless there be some principle laid down to indicate that fact? You have here a provision that you propose to retire a man. Bishop Cooke proposes to say for "specific reasons" and assign them. How is a man to know before he has crossed what some member may say as specific reasons that he has crossed those specific reasons? If you put it on the analogy of existing law according to our Methodist Episcopal Church, South—and I have taken no occasion to see if there is any difference between us and your Church—you cannot close that active career of a Methodist preacher on complaint. You can put him on guard. You can tell him he must not do that again, but you cannot lodge a grand complaint and

say this is the end of your career. I say at least you ought to give the general superintendents what you brethren give to the district superintendents as you call them, and as we continue to call them, our presiding elders. Then we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, while not laid out in terms, there were specific reasons. Anybody who knows the history of the times understands that two months before the delegates started to New York in 1844 the Church was believed to be never so quiet. No one believed it who went there. It runs through their debate, it runs through the history, you can find it in the accounts given by any of the men who had to play a part on that occasion, that they had never gone forward to a General Conference with less expectation of trouble than when they went to that Conference in 1844. No man had the vision to see, however optimistic he might have been, and I do not believe we ought to put the Church in the position of saying that a man is to come up and be confronted with things he never thought of and could not have anticipated and be told this is the end of your personal career. I am not making a personal application. My tendency runs the other way. I am looking to the men who are coming after me, some of whom may be, because there have been such men among us, the very best and most useful that Methodism or any other Church has ever produced. You know the pathway of the man who would best serve his generation is the pathway over obstacles and opposition from the very people he would benefit. It has always been so in Church history, and it is the case to-day, and the man who helps the world must help the world against the world's unwillingness to be helped, and therefore he must cross some things that may end his career. There were the ancestors of some of you and my ancestors who could not find any use for Roger Williams and sent him off to some other place, and there may another Roger Williams arise. If we are going to make an end of these matters, there must be something that is not going to throw the door wide open as it has been wide open for any such difficulties as have occurred to the Church heretofore.

Joseph Van Cleve: If I were rather ignorant of the proceedings of the Methodist Episcopal Church and listened to this debate, I think I would always be inclined to question within my own mind if the retiring of a bishop is not one of the favorite recreations of a General Conference. It seems to be the opinion that the General Conference would do such a thing with *alacrity*. I am perfectly sure that for our own branch of the Church any of us who have shared the proceedings of this kind will say that the thing done with most reluctance in the General Conference and one of the most difficult things to be carried is the retirement of a bishop; and when it requires two-thirds of the General Con-

ference to do the thing or requires the concurrence of the General Conference and a majority of the people with whom he lives, it cannot be done. Not long since it was said with a degree of positiveness that put conviction in the mind that a man with a proper degree of self-respect would hardly care to be a candidate when he had only half a chance of being elected. I could do that with infinitely more of self-respect than I could continue to be a bishop if two-thirds of the General Conference wished to have me retire. When you come to having specific matters particularly named of unacceptability or inefficiency, you will find it extremely difficult to make them as specific as charges ought to be; and if they are not so, there will be danger of the charges being thrown out. There will be a contest on that very point, and I quite agree with my brother here to my right, who suggested that we will be far safer to leave that rule as it stands, that the General Conference by a two-thirds vote may retire a bishop. There is not a question about that. Quite frequently it is not for any one particular thing that can be set up by itself, morally, intellectually, or otherwise, but it is where a combination of this would create unacceptability, or his unacceptability is a matter of general knowledge. When you make specific charges it would be quite a difficult thing.

A. J. Lamar: I wish to move that we do now take a vote on this whole question in parliamentary order.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That is a motion for the previous question?

A. J. Lamar: Yes, sir; and applied to the whole matter.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I desire that the entire matter be recommitted to the Committee to be reshaped.

A. J. Lamar: A point of order. We are under the previous question.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I think Dr. Blake's motion is in order, and I will take a vote on it.

A vote being taken, the motion to recommit was lost by a vote of 10 to 30.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The question is upon the motion of Bishop Cooke, which was a substitute. The Chair would like to inquire the state of the motion.

Bishop Cooke: I moved to add "provided that the bishop shall not be retired without specific reasons formally presented and sufficiently considered," and I accepted an amendment of the words "nor without adequate representation by the bishop concerned."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Is that the exact wording?

Bishop Cooke: I think that is about it. It can be compared.

The Secretary read the part referred to, as follows: "Provided a bishop shall not be retired without specific reasons having been formally presented nor without adequate representation by the bishop concerned."

A. J. Lamar: Was not there an amendment to put in the words "for unacceptability or inefficiency"?

Secretary Thomas: You proposed that, but it was not accepted.

A. J. Lamar: I proposed it as an amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): An amendment to the substitute would be in order. Did you move it as an amendment to the substitute?

A. J. Lamar: I intended to do so.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Where would the words be inserted?

A. J. Lamar: Read it.

The Secretary read as follows: "Provided a bishop shall not be retired"—

A. J. Lamar: Right there is where it comes in—"except for unacceptability or inefficiency."

David G. Downey: We ought to have the whole record before us as to the report of the Committee and the various amendments and substitutes, so that we could vote intelligently upon the separate items.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You can call for the reading of the papers.

David G. Downey: I call for a reading of the entire matter.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The report of the Committee is no longer in it. Dr. Chappell's substitute took the place of the report of the Committee. It is Dr. Chappell's proposed substitute which was adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The Secretary will give us the record.

Secretary Harris: Dr. Chappell's substitute which takes the place of the report of the Committee was "to confirm their election by a general rule, to superannuate them upon reaching a determined age by a three-fourths vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting, and to retire them from further effective service in the episcopacy"—

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Dr. Harris is putting in commas where they are not and semicolons and colons where they do not exist. Let me read it: "To confirm their election by a general rule and superannuate them upon reaching a determined age by a three-fourths vote of the General Conference present and voting and to retire them from further effective service in the episcopacy." That was the original report of the Committee which Dr. Chappell's substitute, which was adopted, ousted.

Secretary Harris: I will read that: "Provided it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed."

David G. Downey: Now, what is the amendment on that?

Secretary Harris: Dr. Thomas's amendment to Dr. Chappell's substitute was to insert "for causes hereinafter to be provided for." Then came Dr. Cooke's substitute.

W. N. Ainsworth: Then my motion came and must stand as an amendment to the amendment, since Dr. Thomas finally decided, and with my consent, that he would not press it further.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The whole proposition was the substitution of Bishop Cooke.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: No, sir. Dr Lamar's was the only amendment to that.

Edgar Blake: As a matter of accuracy will you permit me to read the matter as it stands here? I am sure it is in such state that it should be recommitted.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): You can if you desire; but do not debate on it, as we are under the previous question.

Edgar Blake: I will read only: "To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy, to fix according to a uniform principle the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, and to confirm and retire the same." Now listen: "And by a general rule to superannuate them upon reaching a determined age, provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed."

Secretary Thomas: That is not the accurate record. "Fix according to a uniform principle the number of bishops to be elected by the several Regional Conferences and to confirm and retire the same." That is the way I understood it.

Henry Wade Rogers: And I understood that the "retire the same" was left out.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That was changed by the report of the Committee this morning. The "retire" comes in just preceding Dr. Chappell's amendment.

Edgar Blake: It does not appear on my copy.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: It comes in right before Dr. Chappell's amendment.

Edgar Blake: But it is not there. The provision limits the retirement by a two-thirds vote.

Secretary Thomas: The Committee has changed. Perhaps they had authority to do so, but they have changed a paragraph which has already been passed upon.

Bishop McDowell: Now, the matter referred to the Committee was the matter subsequently brought back by the Commit-

tee; and if Dr. Thomas's record does not show it, it should show it.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We are within three minutes of adjournment. Do you wish to continue until we complete this matter?

On motion, the time was extended.

A. F. Watkins: I move that we reconsider the vote by which we decided not to recommit this to the Committee.

The motion was seconded.

A vote being taken, the motion to reconsider was carried.

A further vote being taken, the motion to recommit carried.

A. J. Lamar: I move that we adjourn until two o'clock.

Secretary Thomas: Make it 2:30.

The amendment was agreed to and, being put to a vote, was carried, and the Joint Commission was dismissed with benediction by Dr. Stuart.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Joint Session was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Candler.

Hymn No. 309 was sung: "I Once Was Lost, But Now Am Found."

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Lamar will lead us in prayer.

A. J. Lamar: Our Heavenly Father, we come unto thee with thanks because of thy great mercy for us, because thou hast led us through all the past. Thou hast been mindful of us, and thou hast saved us from our own errors. Thou hast guided us in a way that gives full promise for the future. We thank thee for thy hand being upon us in all the past. And we pray, Lord, that while we are gathered here thou wilt so direct and so guide us that we may be wise and do the things that will make for the peace and prosperity of our Zion, that thou wilt help us in the spirit of brotherly love so that we may reach right conclusions. There are many points upon which we differ. Lord, help us in all things unessential, that we may be willing to yield one to another; and in the things that many of us deem essential do thou so direct us that we shall at last reach a proper agreement. And we pray thee, O Lord, that whatever we do may be blessed in thy sight and that the result of our labors may be so blessed that those labors will make for the enlargement of thy Church and the salvation of all things. O God, we believe that we have done that which is for the best interest of humanity in casting our lot with our allies; and we pray thee, O Lord, that thy protecting arm may still be over our nation, that thou wilt bless the troops that go across the water that will engage in the great storm, and that thou wilt bring this war to such a conclusion

as shall be to the glory of thy name and for the lasting benefit of all people. We beseech thee to forgive our sins and accept us and keep us and guide us in our deliberations and save us, O Lord, from all error; and if we fall into error, do thou overrule us, we ask only in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler) : I will read the first chapter of the Acts :

The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach,

Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen :

To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God :

And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me.

For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.

When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?

And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.

But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.

And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.

And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel;

Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.

Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey.

And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.

These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.

And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty.)

Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.

For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry.

Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.

And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood.

For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take.

400 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us,

Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.

And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias.

And they prayed, and said, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen,

That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place.

And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell on Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Luke begins his narrative by showing what Jesus can do. The words were not selected accidentally, but carefully with a view that this treatise shall show what Jesus continues to do. The authorities tell us the Acts should not be regarded as a complete history of everything pertaining to Christianity. He said: "I will build my Church." It was not built then. Nobody was able to erect a Church; only he could see all the future, forecast and direct movements. We have the glorious history of the Church behind us and its mission before us, and yet we, like they, ask for what we shall need. It is not for you to know times and seasons. What you need is not a blue print of the journey before you, but power from on high for the work that is upon you.

Hymn No. 193 was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Blake will lead us in prayer.

Edgar Blake: Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we lift our voices in admiration and our hearts in praise of thee. We thank thee for the way in which thou hast led us up to this time. Thou hast made provision for all our wants, thy mercies have been renewed every morning and every evening, and even while we wait before thee in this place thou hast been with us. Now we come again to commit ourselves to thee and surrender our minds and hearts under the influences of thy Spirit, that thou mayst guide us during all our deliberations. Give us this, our prayer, and we ask thee to forgive us our sins in Jesus's name. Amen.

The roll call showed the following members present: From the M. E. Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace. Laymen, C. W. Kinne, A. W. Harris, I. G. Penn, J. R. Joy, H. W. Rogers, William Rule, Alex. Simpson, Jr., C. M. Stuart. From the M. E. Church, South: Bishops Collins Denny,

E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah. Ministers, Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I now turn the meeting over to Bishop Cranston.

Bishop McDowell: The Committee has referred to it various matters that were presented this morning. Mr. Simpson will present this report.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: The Committee has concurred in the report I presented. Following the words immediately preceding the resolution of Dr. Chappell which was adopted these words are inserted: "and to retire them for inefficiency or unacceptability after due notice or proper hearing." The Committee also made some slight changes in the wording of the two subsequent sentences to make them read better in connection with the substitute of Dr. Chappell. Therefore I will read the whole substitute now before us for your consideration:

Subsection 7: To define and fix the privileges and powers and duties of the episcopacy, to fix according to a uniform principle the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences, to confirm their election by general rules, to superannuate them upon reaching a determined age, and to retire them for inefficiency and unacceptability after due notice and proper hearing, provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to retire a bishop without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed; and provided, further, that a bishop shall be assigned for residential supervision to the Regional Jurisdiction by which he was elected; but no bishop may be assigned by the General Conference to any Annual Conference for residential supervision unless a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in the assignment; and provided, still further, that the General Conference may assign a bishop within any jurisdiction with the consent of the delegates of the Regional Conference from which the bishop is to be taken and to which he is to be assigned.

I take it, as this report comes in under the order to report back, it takes precedence over all other things before us.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair understands the report was recommitted under the operation of the previous question, and the report comes back to us still under the requirements of the previous question.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Dr. Ainsworth's amendment is still before us. Bishop Cooke, Dr. Thomas, and Dr. Lamar have withdrawn their suggestions because they are disposed of.

C. M. Bishop: Is the discussion of an amendment in order under the previous question?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I think not.

Edgar Blake : Are we under the previous question?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Yes.

Bishop Candler : A point of order. I think the previous question was exhausted when we disposed of everything before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Chair does not believe that, and I will not go back into the past—

Alexander Simpson, Jr. : I move the previous question now, and that will bring a vote on Dr. Ainsworth's amendment and then upon this report.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, the main question was ordered.

W. N. Ainsworth : Then my amendment is still pending under the ruling of the Chair—namely, that the words "infirmity or insufficiency" be substituted for "inefficiency or unacceptability."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Yes.

W. N. Ainsworth : I am sorry that I have not the privilege of a word; but if the ruling is that we are under the previous question, of course I cannot make any remarks.

Edgar Blake : I ask unanimous consent to hear Dr. Ainsworth.

Unanimous consent was given.

W. N. Ainsworth : I wish to call attention merely to this: If a bishop may be retired by the General Conference on the ground of unacceptability, and that not any more particularly defined than that, it might be possible that some General Conference would come along disposed to retire a man who had walked before God in fidelity to all the vows of his consecration and who had efficiently discharged all the duties that were incumbent upon him, but there might be a desire to retire him merely that two or three places might be vacated in the College of Bishops and also that the friends of other men might be able to put them into the episcopacy. I believe under the term "inefficiency" there might be brought in a great deal in the way of unacceptability, but it occurs to me that there ought to be some well grounded and thoroughly specified inefficiency on the part of a bishop before he should be retired by a mere vote of the General Conference.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Ainsworth was lost.

Bishop McDowell : I want to offer an amendment.

Alexander Simpson, Jr. : I rise to a point of order. We are under the previous question, and no further amendments can be offered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : The Chair ruled that you cannot discuss, but that you can amend.

Bishop Hamilton : I do not want to appeal from the decision of the Chair, and it will not be necessary to do so if we are under

the rules of our own General Conference. You will find as a matter of history as you go back that we once attempted something about that right to amend, and we had the most terrible tangle.

Bishop Candler: We did adopt the general rules of parliamentary practice in all bodies, and beyond all question the usual parliamentary law would not allow you to do anything but take up the pending question.

Edgar Blake: Our rules read as follows under the previous question: "If a call for the previous question be sustained, nevertheless under this rule under the previous question it shall be in order to divide or move to refer or recommit or lay on the table."

Bishop Candler: Those motions are admissible.

Bishop McDowell: By what rule did Brother Ainsworth's amendment get before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It was before us before the previous question. He did not compound with the committee as the other members did and that left this amendment. The amendment of Bishop McDowell is now in order.

Bishop Denny: I have no idea what Bishop McDowell wants to offer, but on general principles I think I shall not agree with him when he offers it, but I hope he will be allowed to offer it.

Bishop McDowell: If it is not in order, I shall not offer it.

Joseph Van Cleve: Might it not be possible to bring in other amendments later?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We will see about that later. We are now in process of voting.

A vote being taken, the report of the Committee was adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Is there any other matter?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That passes the whole matter which was recommitted. We now go on with the report.

Edgar Blake: That concludes the matter committed to that special committee, and we will now consider the whole report.

Bishop McDowell: At this point the matters that have been presented by and in care of a special subcommittee of the standing committee are exhausted, and Dr. Du Bose, as Secretary of the General Committee, will now present the next item.

H. M. Du Bose: Dr. Blake has charge of that.

Edgar Blake: No, the matters are out of the way that were committed to us; but I suggest that we begin at the beginning of the report, and there were several items to be fixed up.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What page of the original report are you on?

Edgar Blake: Page 1.

Bishop Hamilton: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I expected to leave on the three o'clock train, but by a careful

study of the time tables and conference with the agent I find that I can remain until 9:45 to-night. I desire to say that in all the work we have done so far with the utmost brotherliness toward each member of our Commission and each and every member of the other Commission I do not want to leave this Commission with the impression to go abroad that we have dodged any of the questions that determine really whether we shall adopt this or not. I must feel that the present matters are wholly tentative unless certain involved relations of Regional Conferences and the status of the negro in the reorganized Church are determined beforehand, so that we shall know what their relation is to this matter. We have been so delicate and careful each for the other that we have put off until the very last moment, for I learn—I interpolate here—that I am not the only brother who has engaged his sleeper for to-night; and if we disintegrate and go away in great haste with these matters remaining as they are, we cannot avoid the impression that will go abroad that these questions have been slighted. I won't say that we have shirked our duty; I won't say that we dodged. Those are not pleasant words to you. But I will say that we gossiped of it at the hotel. Our brethren did, and your brethren did, and we hear certain things said. We hear you, and you hear us; and if we are to be guided in any sense by some of these unofficial utterances, they certainly have the intimation that if we wait enough on our side things will go all our way. Our colored brethren do feel that if we go away without considering their status until we meet again there will be nothing but pressure put upon them and agitation from one end to the other to get them to comply, not with the Chattanooga plan, but the plan of your General Conference. You brethren know me well enough to know that I never say a hard word intentionally and that I have never shown any spirit; but I shall have to tell you as squarely as I am here that when you come to us and ask us to turn out or invite out or get out by outside influences 350,000 members of our Conference I have to remember the history of fifty years, and not only the history of fifty years, but I am to remember the trend of the nation, which is in harmony with our views in this matter. I do not want to make a speech at this time; but I will have to do it if it is necessary to get something done on this matter, and I say this in the interest of what I know to be the majority influence, the majority feeling and sentiment of the Methodist Episcopal Church. And for that reason I do not want the impression to go abroad that we are afraid of this matter until a certain time; and if you give it time enough, it will all come the way we want it. That is the impression I don't want to obtain, and therefore I think it is better for you to take up this afternoon and evening in the discussion of some of these questions. Just because we

can't agree on them is no reason why it should be final. There is no reason why we should separate with any different spirit than we have had from the beginning. If we go about it and discuss all the obstacles, it is an easy matter to refer them in some form to a general committee and appoint another meeting when we shall come together before your General Conference. That is the square, open way of doing this. I have said this in our Commission, and I shall say it before I go away in a sort of valedictory in the way of a privileged question. I do not think I am suggesting anything to make trouble, but don't let us go away feeling that we are afraid to talk these questions over in a brotherly way and state our views of them. We may fail utterly, but we won't let it go as an ultimatum. I went over to the depot to buy my ticket for home to-night, and I found three or four other men over there, and I came to inquire, and I found that there were three or four men who had engaged their sleepers to-night, and I said what about it, and it was said if you let this thing simmer it will take care of itself. I am not going to let it take care of itself when my responsibility is involved. I do not think I would be doing my duty unless I looked you straight in the face and said so.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I call for the regular order.

David G. Downey: I think before we take up the regular order we ought to determine the matter referred to by Bishop Hamilton. I think it might be well to find out how many are going to be off after to-night. Then we might know whether it is better to take this matter up this afternoon or wait until to-morrow. I greatly fear from what I hear that a good many are going to go away to-night, and our Commission will be left with only about two-thirds of the members and maybe not so many. I sympathize with the idea that we should have a brotherly conversation on these important matters so that the matter can be in our minds for future consideration. I think we should make that question an order of the day, and I am inclined to move, if we are going to be here until 9:45, that the order of the day begin with the evening session at eight o'clock. We may meet at 7:30 and then discuss the status of the negro in the reorganized Church.

H. M. Du Bois: I second the motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Do you mean to suspend the order under which we are proceeding now?

David G. Downey: Not the order this afternoon.

C. M. Bishop: I wish to offer an objection to that based upon a general conception of what we all know about night sessions. Already some of our brethren are gone, and others are arranging to go. If we crowd all the hours that are remaining to us until

9:45 to-night full of work, we would not be able to handle this question which is perfectly clear to our minds now and is perhaps the most delicate one to come before us. Personally I am quite in favor of going through to the end, and, to my very great inconvenience, I have arranged, so far as I am concerned, to stay, at any rate, until to-morrow evening; but I would not be willing, for my part or so far as the Commission to which I am attached is concerned, to have this matter brought up in a partly disintegrated Commission unless it were committed to them as a subcommittee. I do not believe it would be safe. I think it is quite well for us to hear Bishop Hamilton express his opinion, but along with that frank opinion to lay upon us to do something by 9:45 or to go out to the Church with the statement that we have dodged something—I protest against that as being the only interpretation that can go out. I myself altogether favor the suggestion of Dr. Downey that we have a full and frank conversation and presentation of views on this subject, and I deprecate the idea of having that come at the close of a hard day's work and a night session. Those gentlemen who have had the largest experience in bodies of this sort tell us that harm is usually the result of sessions like this. We have discovered it in our own experience here. The wisest gentlemen in this whole company came back saying we were dreaming and that last night we were walking in our sleep and things like that; and we were, and it was all a sort of irregular walking too. Collisions would have been avoided if we had not been groping in the darkness, and I protest against considering this aspect of the question, which is itself loaded with explosives, if one may judge from the countenances as one looks over the company, and I protest against the great Commission representing these two great historic Churches getting themselves into such shape that the probabilities are ten to one that the thing will go up in smoke. Some of us are ready to stay until to-morrow or the next day; but I, for one, am not willing to have this thing forced upon us in a crowded, strained session when we cannot do ourselves or our Churches justice. It would be far better to leave this delicate matter for further consideration and for the education of these people, North and South. They are a peaceable people for the most part. They have been taught in recent years to be patient in view of the possible experience in the midst of the warring world, and we ourselves need to wait notwithstanding the strain that is put upon us. It is of extreme importance to the men in this country at this time that the Methodist Episcopal Churches shall come together and deliver their whole forces against the threatened paganism that may overwhelm us from the paganized world on the other side of the waters; but it is not of great importance that here

in an afternoon, after continued labor of this sort, we should imperil the whole question that is before us, the unification of these Churches. For the first thirty years of this life of mine I have been praying for the unification of these two Churches. I do not mind saying personally to the members of this whole Joint Commission that I am willing personally and as an individual—and I do not speak of myself as a representative now—to make every just concession on this or any other subject that reason could possibly require or Christianity could demand. I am not willing to have my own Church put at a disadvantage or misrepresented or itself moved by a feeling of dissatisfaction or new antagonism against this large section of the nation in which we have in some sense been arrayed for some years. I am not willing for it to be put in a false position or a new array of sectional spirit under the pressure of an appeal coming to us at this late hour when members have engagements that will require them to reserve their sleepers two or three hours from now. Let us stay here or postpone further consideration of these matters that we cannot deliberate concerning now, naturally, with all the care and prayer and earnestness and patience that will be necessary in order to solve so tremendously difficult and delicate a question.

Bishop Hamilton: May I ask the brother a question?

C. M. Bishop: Yes.

Bishop Hamilton: I will put it in two questions: Did you not expect when you came that we would discuss this matter before you went away? Secondly, are you willing, if we stay here, to stay until we get through with it?

C. M. Bishop: Personally I only represent myself, but I expected the matter to be discussed, and I expected to stay long enough to discuss it, and I am perfectly willing to.

John F. Goucher: I am sorry that this motion has been made. There are three questions involved and possibly more. The first question is: Shall we change the order of procedure which we have deliberately determined upon as recommended to us by our standing committee and which we have prosecuted thus far with very delightful results? Now, there must be some great emergency that would cause or justify a change in that procedure, and particularly when we are in the midst of the consideration of certain reports which have precedence in the judgment of the Committee, when we are considering the whole problem, and the progress made has fully justified the wisdom of the Committee and the conclusion arrived at. Therefore I do not think we can hastily and unadvisedly and without very extraordinary cause or justification wisely change the order in which we are proceeding. In the second place, unless we change the order of procedure, it is asked that we shall give precedence to one particular subject. If the brethren must go home to such an extent that they cannot

consider the matter, that makes it impossible for the matter to be considered. So far we have not gone through the entire program because a considerable number of the Commission were not willing nor desirous of going through the program. Some people, for causes they could not control, have had to absent themselves; and because some persons found it desirable to leave the meetings of the sessions, therefore they suppose that something contrary to their wishes will be done, not with a deliberate purpose and not from any predetermined plans, but by limitations which certain persons have put upon the Commission, notwithstanding the Commission notified us at Baltimore that this session would doubtless be a long one. If the Commission's work is interfered with by the absence of certain persons, emphasis is not placed in the right spot. I do not see why, if we cannot come to a conclusion, we should pick out one matter more than another. There are nine or ten—and it will be a grave question—it would be unwise for us to attempt at this session of the Commission to determine the numbers and the boundaries of the Regional Conferences. My judgment would say no; because if we determine the number of the Regional Conferences and the borders of the Regional Conferences, we will then introduce an almost unlimited number of conflicts. The Church at large will vote on general principles and will give general principles hearty indorsement if it can consider those general principles without the embarrassment of personal interest in the details of application. I dare say that in fixing these areas there will be one area, concerning the boundaries of which there will not be trouble, questioning, and opposition. If we determine at the present session the number of areas and boundaries, that will introduce so much of a personal element as that it will focus attention on that plan, and the general principles will not have any sort of judicial consideration, and I think, if possible, we should determine the conditions and stop with that at this meeting, referring everything else to the Committees for the subsequent meeting. We are not under any obligation in law to complete the work of our commission at this present sitting. In fact, I think we made greater progress when we completed these reports than has ever been done before. Another thing, we haven't taken any consideration of the great benevolent institutions and of our publishing interests and of our financial institutions and all the large areas which we cannot wisely consider until we have determined the conditions of the Conferences, getting the general principles fixed. We haven't yet at all touched any work in Southern Asia or in Latin America or in Europe or among our colored constituents. They are practically in the same class in this particular. We haven't come to those things. We haven't spoken of Subregional Conferences. We haven't decided what shall be the differentiate

between the Regional Conferences and the areas not sufficiently developed to constitute a full Regional Conference. That cannot be determined. The relationship cannot be determined until we determine the fundamental principles of the administration of that kind of work. Therefore we can say that we have gone thus far, we have discussed these things and will come to them naturally, but I do not propose to trample over everything else to get something that I am not certain of. I deprecate any sort of precedence in this matter. In the third place, I think there are two problems here. Why should we take such a delicate problem and carry it into a night session when men are absorbed as we are? We would discredit its deliberate consideration by putting it into a night session. But after that a number will leave at 9:45, and those the very ones who want to have this thing settled and who are urging that we have the thing closed; and if we attempt to do it, the natural thing will be nervous tension, and no good can result. I hope that this resolution will not prevail.

J. R. Pepper: I have not spoken at all yet. I came here to stick to the end, and I intend to do it, no matter how long you stay. There are two particular things with reference to this session that I hope we shall achieve. I haven't the slightest idea that we can get through with all the problems, but the first is that we should agree on some particular way of solving these regional territories. The second thing is that we shall be able to give to our Churches the different things we have agreed on. I don't think it makes so much difference what those things are; but if we can announce that certain definite conclusions have been reached on two or three things, if we can say that we have agreed upon the Regional Conferences and upon the General Conference and the Judicial Council, I would not care so much which of the items, just so that we are in agreement and that we have made substantial progress and that it is a prophecy of what shall be done at the next meeting. I figure we have to have two or three more meetings before we can conclude all these problems. I feel greatly encouraged over what we have done. I have been rejoiced that we have been able to reach conclusions upon what has been accomplished. I hope none of us will hurry away. I have already foregone a lot of engagements that I expected to have filled, but inasmuch as I have done that, I am going to stay, as I came here to do, until we are entirely through with this work, and we should conclude in order, and I hope every brother who can possibly do so will remain, because I think it is highly important that we should conclude our work in good order.

Bishop Mouzon: On account of very serious illness in my family it has been my purpose to leave on the 9:45 train this

evening. My berth in the Pullman is not only reserved, but bought, and my ticket is in my pocket. I do feel that my duty calls me home as soon as I can possibly get there. However, if it is the desire of the majority of the brethren representing the Methodist Episcopal Church and a majority of the brethren representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that the discussion of the status of the colored membership of the Church in the reorganized Church be taken up before we adjourn, personally I would be willing, if necessary to do that, to postpone the hour of my departure, although I am almost under compulsion in this matter to leave for my home. I had thought it would not be wise to take up the report of your Committee on the Status of the Colored Membership of the Church and to discuss that report, for I happen to have some knowledge of what that report contains, and I am quite sure that that report does not satisfy those who prepared the report, and they shall need further time before presenting a report that they would like to present. That report has not been gotten into shape. It does not come to this Commission as the report on Conferences or the report on Judicial Council comes; and I trust my friend, Bishop Hamilton, will believe there is not one of us who has desired to postpone this matter in the hope that we may be able to have our own way in the end. There is but one way I desire to have, and that is God's way. Now, we have accomplished here what we were not able to accomplish at Baltimore. Six months has made a great difference. We have seen better. We have come to understand our problems better. I do believe that six months more will make a great difference in our method of approaching this other serious question which is before us and which we desire to settle in God's way and not in our way, and I have thought if, after we have some informal discussion bearing on this question without taking up formally the report of the Committee—I have thought that if we could have such discussion and then refer it to the Committee until that Committee could bring us in a well formulated report, in six months we might see something we cannot see now, and your people and our people might be able to understand the whole situation better than they do now. Not that we desire to force you to do anything or that you desire to force us to do anything, but we have felt the need of time and patience and prayer and thought. Will you pardon me two or three passages of scripture that are in my mind this past few days. One is: "The God of patience"—the God of patience, the God who is patient in accomplishing his end, the God who gives us patience, and I have been praying that he might give us patience. And another passage has been in my mind: "He that believeth shall not make haste." Haste is an evidence of doubt. Let us

have faith enough to be patient; and, as I said, if it is the will of the majority of the brethren to take up this matter, I shall try to bring myself to believe that I will be justified in postponing the time of my departure.

H. M. Du Rose: I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded by several.

Bishop Hamilton: I have no objection to that, but I do not want anybody to think I am going away to avoid this discussion. Brother Goucher implied that.

John F. Goucher: I never meant to imply it.

Bishop Hamilton: I planned for a week, and I tried to find out if we would have any longer time, and my obligations are such that it would not only disturb me, but a great many other persons who can in no other way but by my going there be satisfied. It is not a question of whether I am here or not. It is not the negro question. Don't think that that is the only question you are going to have that will give trouble. One of your great difficulties is going to be the boundaries of the Regional Conferences and taking care of the foreign work. I have been interested in that. I don't want you to think my going away will have any effect. If you will consider them in my absence, all right. I didn't want it thought—

David G. Downey: Did I not have the floor?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, Bishop Hamilton was speaking on a personal matter.

Bishop Hamilton: Well, I am through.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Well, there was a motion for the previous question, and that is not debatable.

Bishop Leete: Inasmuch as there has been so much of general consent, why should not Brother Downey have general consent?

A. J. Lamar: I ask unanimous consent that Brother Downey be heard.

No dissent was heard.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Proceed, Brother Downey.

David G. Downey: I have no intention of going home. There have been remarks that we were running around and that certain people couldn't stay to finish the report. I had hoped that Dr. Goucher would end his speech by moving to take up that question to-night. I am willing to have it considered to-morrow morning, but so many men are going away that it might escape our attention. That is all.

A vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, what is the motion of Brother Downey?

David G. Downey: To take this matter up at 7:30.

A vote being taken, the motion was lost.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Proceed with the reading of the report.

Edgar Blake : If the members of the Commission will turn to the first page of the report on "Other Conferences," "Article I.—Pastoral Charges" reads:

The membership of the Church shall be divided into local societies, one or more of which shall constitute a pastoral charge.

There are no changes on that, and I move its approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake : "Article II.—Church Conferences" :

A Church Conference, composed of all the members of the local Society and resident members of the Annual Conference and such others as the General Conference may prescribe, shall be held at such times and places as the Church Conference shall decide. It shall elect such a number of delegates to the District Conference as may be fixed by the General Conference.

I move the tentative approval of that article.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake : "Article III.—Quarterly Conferences" :

A Quarterly Conference shall be organized in each pastoral charge and shall be composed of such persons and have such powers as the General Conference may determine.

I move the tentative approval of that article.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake : "Article IV.—District Conferences" :

There shall be held annually in each District of the Annual Conference a District Conference, to be composed of the traveling, supernumerary, and local preachers of the district, of delegates from the Church Conferences, and of such other members as may be designated by the General Conference.

I move the tentative approval of that article.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake : Article V. is modified and reads as follows :

The traveling preachers, together with one layman from each pastoral charge, shall be organized into Annual Conferences with such privileges and duties as are hereinafter provided for. The lay representative of a pastoral charge shall be elected by the Church Conference, except where there are two or more Church Conferences in one pastoral charge the lay representative shall be elected by the Quarterly Conference of the charge.

Bishop Candler : I think you should have two lay members, one elected by the Church Conference and one by the Quarterly Conference. It would be quite representative enough if you would have the Quarterly Conference to elect all.

Edgar Blake : The reason for providing that the lay representatives in the Annual Conference should be elected by the

Church Conference was that we thought that it was rather more democratic to have the representative elected by the Church membership than by a select group, and for that reason we recommended that the Annual Conference be elected by the Church Conference, except where there were two or more Church Conferences in a pastoral charge, as oftentimes is the case. In such cases we felt that we could not provide that there should be a lay representative from each, and we felt that the Quarterly Conference was the only body which could act for them; and we recommended, not two classes of lay representatives, but one class elected by the Church Conference where there is one Church Conference, but elected by the Quarterly Conference where there are two or three or more.

Bishop Candler: The idea of democratizing the Church was probably what influenced the Committee in making this report; but in the South, and I dare say throughout the Church in the North, both brothers would be incompetent and inefficient, and you only democratize the stations and give them an amount of power, and I think the common folks ought to care. The truth is, I never have been able to accept the idea of democratizing the Church, and I can give you some good reasons. This is always a young world. Scriptures lament a government under children. I don't think we should turn the government of the Church over to children. Besides, you have not democratized the Church, and you cannot do it by what you have done. For example, not being able to get statistics in but one branch of Methodism, there are seven thousand traveling preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and two million laymen; and if you democratize the General Conference, there won't be but about a half a preacher in seven thousand preachers that have a representative equal to two million laymen. You cannot democratize the General Conference, and why should you undertake the impossible? I would say you had leopardized it. The country people are spotted with one kind and the other people with another. You are trying an impossible proposition. Now, I want to say another thing. It is said that a preacher is nothing but a layman set apart to preach. That is not Methodism. Methodism assumes that the Lord Almighty has called him, and the Church unites on him. They gave a preacher the same governing functions as were ordained by Paul, I believe. I am a mighty good Democrat as Democrats go.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That is capable of two interpretations.

Bishop Candler: Yes, that is as equivocal as the Delphic Oracle, but I believe we had better put it one way or the other. They are all people, and let us elect them in the rural districts and stations or else all in the Quarterly Conference. It seems to me

when the democratizing idea breaks down in the General Assembly the best thing to do is to put in the Quarterly Conference. I have known of some democracy in Churches. There was a good brother once who undertook to get rid of a preacher because he had a brother-in-law that he wanted to put in. In three months he got three girls turned out of the Church and then turned around and elected his brother-in-law as preacher and turned out the other preacher. That is practical democracy.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think I have a practical solution for this question of the participation of laymen in all the councils of the Church, and but for one reason I would be entirely willing to see one lay representative from every pastoral charge in the Annual Conference, but with us the matter of hospitality makes that extremely inconvenient, if not entirely impossible. Where there is a Conference that has in it three hundred ministers in full connection coming from three hundred pastoral charges, if you had one lay representative from each pastoral charge, there will be six hundred members in the Annual Conference, and there would be very few towns found in the Annual Conference that could furnish the free entertainment we receive for our Annual Conference. It seems to me, therefore, this would be a better solution of the question: That we have one lay representative in the Annual Conference for every thousand members of the Church in a presiding elder's district, to be elected by the lay representatives in the District Conference. The representation then would be conformable to the ideas of representation that have prevailed in our arrangement up to this time—namely, based upon the number of Church membership. Otherwise you have a Church with two thousand members having one delegate to the Annual Conference and a Church with fifty members having one representative in the Annual Conference. But if you have one lay representative for every thousand delegates in the presiding elder's district, to be elected by the lay representatives, you have given the proportionate representation to every part of the Annual Conference that shall come up through appropriate representatives to the Annual Conference. Moreover, if you take from the District Conference the election of representatives to the Annual Conference, you have at least robbed the District Conferences of one of the important features of that annual meeting and, therefore, have taken away one large feature of attraction that brings many laymen to it. I therefore move you as an amendment to that article an addition as follows: "Together with one layman for every one thousand members in the district, to be elected by the members in the District Conference." I will put that in proper form.

Bishop Cooke: Would you be willing to insert in your amendment an age limit?

W. N. Ainsworth: Is not that provided for somewhere else? I think it is provided who shall go to the District Conference.

Bishop Cooke: But no age limit is in either of them. What I want is that those who are to be elected by the Church Conference or Quarterly Conference or any other Conference shall be of a certain age, that a delegate shall be of a certain age.

W. N. Ainsworth: I should say he ought to be twenty-five years old to go to the Annual Conference or something like that, but I thought that was provided for elsewhere.

Bishop Cooke: That was to the General Conference.

Bishop Denny: That was to the Regional Conference.

W. N. Ainsworth: I will accept that twenty-five-year age limit.

David G. Downey: I very much sympathize with the position of Dr. Ainsworth. There is, however, this difficulty in carrying out his suggestion, and that is, we would have to make a lot of District Conferences, because with us the District Conference is pretty largely a name. There may be, and doubtless there are, in the North and Northwest and far West vital District Conferences; but for the most part our District Conferences have fallen into innocuous desuetude, and I do not know whether it would be possible to revive the District Conferences as you have them in the South. It might be a good thing if we could. Dr. Ainsworth talked about Conferences of five or six hundred people. Perhaps Dr. Blake can tell us how many members are in the Northeast.

Edwin M. Randall: Five hundred.

David G. Downey: That would make an Annual Conference of one thousand.

Edgar Blake: Not that many.

David G. Downey: It wouldn't be far from that. We are face to face with a practical difficulty. I don't know how you are to arrange it; but if necessary, I think this might be recommitted. I think we should in some way meet the suggestions of Bishop Candler and Dr. Ainsworth. I don't want to make a motion, but we are here facing what seems to me to be a practical difficulty in this matter of representation in the Annual Conference.

Bishop Cooke: The more I look into this and the more my memory gets to work, the more I am afraid of it. I think it runs counter to some laws in some other States. There was a case on the Pacific Coast where one part of the Church wanted to change the charter. Those who were opposed to it felt themselves in the minority; but when there was a Church Conference called, the party opposed to it got out all of their children, and they voted the children and prevented the action of the ruling or supporting element of the Church. A man who did little toward the maintenance of the Church or the maintenance of the

missions of the Church could vote two or three children, and, with himself and wife, there would be five votes against one family whose children were grown and gone, and there was a great inequality; but it was held that the members of the Church were members of the corporation and that the charter of the corporation could not be changed without the consent of the members and that the children were members, and there the matter stood. Now, here a Church Conference is composed of all the members of the local society. This Church Conference, composed of all the members of the society, votes; and children are members of the society, and therefore the children vote. It does seem to me there ought to be some remedy in the way of an age limit, in the voting.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Dr. Ainsworth accepted that.

Bishop Cooke: No, he did not.

E. B. Chappell: This is out of order as a matter of parliamentary usage; but I am going to suggest in line with what Bishop Cooke says, and I have written down something on that which ought to have been introduced back in Article II., and if adopted there it would clarify matters: "Provided in the election only those members are allowed to vote who are over eighteen years of age."

A. J. Lamar: I think this language would be more satisfactory: "Provided that no member of a Church Conference shall be entitled to vote who has not attained the age of eighteen years."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You have passed Article II.

Edgar Blake: May we ask unanimous consent to go back to that?

John M. Moore: Is it not a fact that Dr. Blake would accept this amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair didn't understand that.

Bishop Cooke: Dr. Blake stated that by common consent he would accept the amendment that Dr. Lamar offered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Have we unanimous consent to go back to Article II. and make this change?

W. N. Ainsworth: It seems to be a matter of common consent that we should turn back and add that in electing delegates to the District Conferences only those members who have attained the age of eighteen shall vote.

Edgar Blake: The amendment offered by Dr. Lamar is as follows: "Provided that in selecting members to the District Conference no member of a Church Conference shall be entitled to vote who has not attained the age of eighteen years." I would suggest the broadening of that to provide that a member of a Church Conference shall not vote on any proposition unless he

has attained the age of eighteen. There are a good many local matters to be covered that are quite as acute as the election of delegates to a District or Annual Conference.

By common consent this amendment was agreed to.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : We will now go back to Article V.

Edwin M. Randall : I desire, if I can get the opportunity, to make a privileged motion. It is to clarify the purpose before us. The way we left the matter a while ago a number of us are still counting on going to-night. I think we should know when we adjourn. I wish to say that I am prepared to stay as long as others will and do business.

Edgar Blake : Can we not delay fixing the time of the adjournment until the close of the afternoon session?

Edwin M. Randall : I am not anxious myself, but there are some of us who must either confirm or cancel our reservations for the night and do it quickly.

Edgar Blake : I withdraw my objection.

Edwin M. Randall : I move that the time for the adjournment of this meeting of the Joint Session shall be at the close of to-morrow afternoon's session.

Bishop Leete : I would like to amend that by fixing that it be at the close of this night's session. I do that for this reason : I am personally willing to stay as long as the crowd; but I think we have gotten along to a pretty good stage of progress, and I don't want to be one of a company of men hanging on after most of the men have gone and doing business that will not be effective.

Edwin M. Randall : May I modify my suggestion? I made the motion that we adjourn at the close of to-morrow afternoon's session largely as a test to see if it could get sufficient support. I now withdraw that and move that when we adjourn this afternoon we adjourn to meet at seven o'clock for an evening session and that we finally adjourn at nine o'clock.

T. D. Samford : I arose for the purpose of asking leave of absence, but I shall wait until after the determination of whether we are to adjourn to-night or to-morrow morning.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Now, after we get through with what we propose to handle tentatively at this meeting, there will be time required to shape up matters and look after the correctness of the journal and all that, and somebody ought to stay here and see that that is done in order.

E. C. Reeves : I want to make a remark if you will let me. If we adjourn and go away from here and don't finish the report, it is going to affect our Church throughout the entire country. We ought to finish some one or two reports and then report to the Churches that we have actually done something. If we don't do that, it will be unfortunate.

John F. Goucher: We ought to determine before we leave the time and place of our next meeting, and that may take some discussion.

Bishop Cooke: Another matter is the appointment of a committee to make the communication to the Churches as to what has been done.

Edgar Blake: Was the matter of the journal settled?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Committee on Order and Procedure will have in mind the matters relating to the closing session.

Edgar Blake: Inasmuch as the only motion before us is for adjournment to-morrow night, could we not delay this matter until the close of the session, so that we could proceed with the consideration of this report?

Bishop Candler: I quite agree with Brother Reeves that we ought to finish some one report. You have adopted tentatively everything that has been adopted. We have found it easy to agree on some general matters of government; but the gist of the report you have not touched yet, and it seems to me we ought to stay here until we finish at least one report. It is not my purpose to control anything. There is always pressure on a man who has anything to do. The idle man does not do anything, and the busy man is always under pressure. I am here to stay until dog days, if necessary, and I think it would be far better, though it would pinch me a little. I am a little distressed about my boy going to war. I am not trying to keep him from going, but I am sorrowful over it; and I have a sick wife, not acutely sick like Brother Mouzon's wife, but she is distressed about her boy, and I ought to be with her; but I am willing to stay to finish some of our work.

Bishop McDowell: I would suppose, in a way, it matters a good deal how far we can get while we are now together. In a way, it does not matter so much how much further we get. Personally at very great inconvenience and with an appalling sense that I should be elsewhere, I am nevertheless staying and am prepared to stay to the greatest length of time if necessary. I would feel, however, that if a half dozen or more members of this Commission are obliged to leave to-night and another half dozen by early noon, the Committee would feel that it was so far disintegrated that the doing of business would not be satisfactory to those who would remain. But here is a serious matter. We have tentatively agreed to certain matters. Let us understand that we have tentatively agreed to those matters relating to the Conference, for example, not simply with a view to the completion of that report, but also with a view to the completion of the other reports that are just as vitally related to it as it appears related to the others, so that when we have finished the report of

Conferences we shall not be in shape to nail it down. We shall not be able to say to our Churches this is what we have agreed upon as to Conference: We have agreed on this tentatively, but we may reach an agreement on other matters vitally related to it to reverse ourselves on a half dozen of these things. Our nervousness is not due to one, but to several causes. Our nervousness is due to the fact that we feel we must report some specific adjustment to our Churches. Therefore we are driven just now with a little bit of a sense of hurry. But everybody who belongs to a body like this knows that after ten per cent of the body has gone or a still larger percentage it produces a very unhappy situation with reference to the status of what is done by those who remain when it gets out into the minds of those who have gone. We shall have enough to do when we can present our report to our General Conferences and to our Churches with the understanding that the whole Commission was in support of everything that was done. Now, I myself am not disturbed about that feeling that we must report something to our Churches. I would be perfectly willing to say to our Churches that we shall have our report ready for the General Conference, and at that time we will make the report public, but I do not think we can hurry our business by a partial report, something tentatively agreed upon to send out to the Church at large.

W. N. Ainsworth: There is a great deal in that.

Bishop McDowell: Here comes the partial report with reference to the powers of the Regional Conferences. What it is related to on the one side or the other side does not quite appear. We haven't considered it. Somebody will go to shooting the thing full of holes, and he would not do it at all if he saw it in its entirety. Our official duty is to report to the body which created us and not to anybody else; and I have never agreed, and I did not agree at Baltimore, that we were obliged to report something to the Churches and to the restless fellows who think that unless we can report something absolutely achieved we have been fooling away our time. We have not been fooling away time. If anybody is restless about expense, I am willing to pay all my own. I am willing to adjourn to-night at nine o'clock. The question of appointing chaplains for the army and navy has become most acute and urgent. I don't know whether you know how acute it is. I must get back to Washington and get the Committee on Chaplains together. It is the most serious job that has been presented to me since I have been in our official administration. I am willing to adjourn to-night or to adjourn to-morrow. I am willing to stay until day after to-morrow or the rest of the week, but I am not willing to stay the rest of the week with a partial Commission. There is my point; and if the Commission is going to disintegrate in any considerable number to-

night and in considerable numbers to-morrow at noon, it matters not when we adjourn, the sooner the better.

Bishop Hamilton: I would like to be recorded as saying two or three things at this point of a general character. In the first place, knowing, what we all at our time of life should know, the difficulty of making constitutions which are to affect a large number of people with the absolute necessity of providing ample time for every session and with a body as large as this, we have not months to spend as men do spend in making and revising constitutions for States. Then, on the other hand, our people should be instructed through our editors so that they would understand the gravity of the business and cease being unreasonable in their demands for quick results. The fact is about as Bishop McDowell and others have stated, the task is great. The situation is somewhat acute. A mistake would be disastrous. I thought yesterday it would be very well if we could send out some reports to the people, something definite; but it has come to me, as the talk has proceeded and the necessities of some of the brethren have been revealed, that all that we could publish now would be provocative of discussion, and that would not be profitable at all. Now, if we cannot stay until to-morrow night, let us stay until to-morrow noon, allowing the brothers to go who must go only, and let the rest remain until we can come to an agreement as to what kind of a statement should be made to the Churches, not in the nature of a report, but a statement as to what provision shall be made for completing certain reports that are not evidently to be discussed at this meeting. Now, it is the desire of our Commission that there should be an understanding in regard to the status of the negro. We are under pressure from one side by our colored brethren, who want protection against unreasonable raids upon their patience, things demanded of them beyond what they can comply with, and, on the other hand, the expectations of people, particularly in the Southern section more than in our section. Let us be deliberate about what we do. An adjournment to-night would be under circumstances that would be peevish and irritable and unsatisfactory. An adjournment to-morrow noon or afternoon promises to be something very different in the impression upon ourselves and in the impression that it will make upon our people. It shall be sufficient for any reasonable critic to be told that we found ourselves under the exigencies of the business engagements of some of our lay brethren and some of the bishops compelled to come to an earlier adjournment than we desired. The people are reasonable, after all, when you come to them with the kind of knowledge that ought to affect their judgment concerning such a matter as this.

C. M. Bishop: We have spent two hours of this afternoon's session and have only passed on a few matters that are not un-

important, but that are not anything like as important as some others. We have spent the whole session this afternoon with practically no progress. Can we not have the motions voted on? I would like to have the previous question on whatever is before us.

T. D. Samford: I rose to a question of privilege, and I crave that privilege now. I ask at this point that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of this Commission after to-night's meeting. There are, in my judgment, compelling reasons why I make this request at this time. I deem it unnecessary to go into details before this Commission. I may be permitted to say that I left my home last Thursday a week ago in obedience to a call to come here to labor several days together with the other members of this Commission on the report we have been considering since we have been in session on Wednesday. I have been away some time longer than some other members of the Commission. I also spent several days assisting in the preparation of this report at a meeting in February last. I do not feel that I am a derelict in this matter. If there were any certainty as to when the work of the Commission could be concluded, I would be glad to stay here until that time at any inconvenience; but inasmuch as it seems rather sure that we shall adjourn by to-morrow noon or night, it will be a matter of very great convenience to me if I may be excused to-night instead of to-morrow night, in order that I may meet some important engagements.

Henry Wade Rogers: I move that the request of the gentleman be granted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A. J. Lamar: We must have a report ready for the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which is the first General Conference that meets. It is generally understood among us that we cannot meet earlier than next January, and after that we cannot have another meeting before the General Conference; and if we treat this work as we treated it at Baltimore and as we are treating it in Traverse City, we shall accomplish nothing when we meet in January. I am about as busy a man as there is on this floor. I am not only snowed down as a Publishing Agent, but I have got three or four other commissions of the Church that I am working on, and I am anxious to get away from here, but in justice to our two Churches in the importance of this great work of unification we ought to stay here until we get our work in such shape that we have good reason to conclude that we can complete this work in one more meeting. I am prepared to stay here just as long as it is necessary and at any sacrifice. Now, it may seem picayunish to be calling attention to the money side of it, but when you get down to the bottom facts, I doubt if we have a right to expend the money of the Church at the rate of \$5,000 for the two Churches each time we

come together and multiply these meetings. I doubt if we have a right to do it. I have been almost tempted to enter my protest against it on that ground, but I shall not do it, but we ought to consider that. We have cost the Church \$5,000 at Baltimore, and we had a duck feast. We did some good, but accomplished nothing definite. Why? Because we couldn't stay any longer. This one had to go home, and that one had to go home. The same thing has been repeated at Traverse City. If this work is not important enough to be worthy of our attention in spite of any other call, unless it be a providential call such as moved my friend Bishop Mouzon, we ought to get off the Commission and let somebody be put on here who can attend to the business.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The question now is on the motion for the previous question.

T. D. Samford: I agree with all that Dr. Lamar has said, but I regret very much that I have to rise a second time for a question of personal privilege. The remarks of my esteemed friend following immediately after my request might well appear to have been made on account of my request.

A. J. Lamar: You know better than that.

T. D. Samford: I know better; and I am sure Dr. Lamar, who has a vital connection with my present relations in life, knows the status of my affairs, but the other members may not know, and for that reason I desire to say that if any definite time in the future is fixed to which this Commission will adjourn or until which time it will remain for the definite accomplishment of anything, I will remain at even great sacrifice to myself; but if it is the expectation of the members that the Commission will adjourn to-morrow at noon or to-morrow night, I don't think I should be reproved for asking leave of absence after to-night's session.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Dr. Randall will please state the motion that he made.

Edwin M. Randall: That this Commission finally adjourn at the close of the session to-morrow afternoon.

W. N. Ainsworth: Was not there another motion offered as a substitute?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, I think not.

The vote being taken on the motion of Dr. Randall, it was carried by twenty to eighteen.

Edgar Blake: Now, may I call for the status of Article V.?

Henry Wade Rogers: I hope that the amendment offered by Dr. Ainsworth will not prevail. I do not expect in the limited time left to consume any of it in making a speech, but I want to say in a few words why I hope Dr. Ainsworth's amendment will not prevail. In the first place, our General Conference is committed to the proposition of one layman and one minister in the

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification - 423

Annual Conference. We have sent that down by a two-thirds vote to be voted on by our Church members. In the second place, I hope it will not prevail for the reason that I want to see the Methodist Church in alignment with every other Protestant body in this country. You may take the history of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, of the Episcopal Church, or of the Baptist Church, or of all the other Protestant bodies, and they allow each Church to be represented by a minister and a layman, and I do not see any reason why we cannot conform to the practice of Protestantism. I might say a lot of other things, but I do not want to consume time at this stage of our proceedings. I hope the report of the Committee as presented will be adopted, and let each Church take care of its own delegates; and if it wants to send a delegate, let it do so.

Claudius B. Spencer: I wish to take my stand along by the remarks of Judge Rogers. Did you say one delegate to every thousand members, Dr. Ainsworth?

W. N. Ainsworth: Yes.

Claudius B. Spencer: Since Dr. Ainsworth made that motion, I have looked up some of the Annual Conferences, and I find that the Northeast Ohio Conference would show 534 lay representatives by that reckoning as against 432 ministers. I find that the West Ohio Conference would have 437 lay members as against 336 ministers. I find that the Nebraska would have—

W. N. Ainsworth: May I interrupt the gentleman to ask a question?

Claudius B. Spencer: Yes.

W. N. Ainsworth: Has he one Annual Conference with 500,000 members?

Claudius B. Spencer: I was looking in the wrong column. I shall have to call back those remarks. In any event, I am persuaded that we should provide for a layman from each pastoral charge for the reason that we have at the very extreme very small Conferences which would have but one layman, and those Conferences are important. They are frontier and widely scattered. They have a number of pastors, but only a small number of laymen. I hope the report as read by Dr. Blake will prevail. I am anxious, as Judge Rogers has said, to see the principle of lay representation introduced into the Methodist Episcopal Church, and I am anxious to see well-known laymen in the Conferences. I know there is a large body in the Methodist Church opposed to it still, and one of the things I have hailed this reorganization for was the bringing of laymen, who have every Scriptural and rational right to participate, into the Annual Conferences of our Church. It is one of the incidents of reorganization in which I most earnestly believe, and I hope that it will prevail. Let me add this reason which comes to me, for I have not spoken enough

here to get my sea legs yet, and that is this: There is rising in the Methodist Episcopal Church a movement among the laymen as exemplified in our Laymen's Associations. It is somewhat formidable, and, as I look at it, laymen have no part in the legislation of the Conference, but they have met at the end of the Annual Conference in the same building and taken up miscellaneous jobs quite outside of the work of the Annual Conference and yet in which they assume to vote—I will not say with dictation, but with something bordering on it. Now, I regard it as very necessary that this reform come to our Church, and I hope for manifold reasons there will be a lay representative from every charge as well as a minister in the Annual Conference.

H. M. Du Bose: The Subcommittee which had the preparation of these paragraphs had all of these difficulties before it. The Subcommittee originated the representation in the General Conference and the District Conference as is the case in the Southern section of the Church, but we encountered two difficulties when we brought our report to the General Committee, and I think it might be well to have this brought out, and then maybe we can determine our way out of the difficulties. The first difficulty was that the District Conference is not in use among our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Another difficulty was that this matter of lay representation was one of the basic principles and was understood to be introduced as a concession to the Methodist Protestant Church. I am just reminded by Bishop McDowell that if a thing of this sort becomes basic it becomes incurable, which reminds me of the old colored preacher's interpretation of a passage of the Scripture relating to divorce. He said pneumonia or typhoid might be treated by doctors and relieved, but if a man had a divorce he was hopeless. So we got into the basic difficulties. If we can make up our minds to brush aside the basic difficulty and relegate it to the rear, we might then have an open field to deal with the District Conference proposition which would be preferable to us. The Subcommittee recommended eight delegates from each District Conference to the Annual Conference, which would be a multiplication by two of the representation we now have, but the difficulty now has been that the District Conference has not been in general use by our brethren on the other side.

W. N. Ainsworth: We provided that it shall.

H. M. Du Bose: Yes; but the first point is to make up our minds to disregard the understanding we have had with the Methodist Protestant Church. Brethren, if we do that, we can get out of the difficulty. We can return eight members from the District Conference and thus meet all objections. I exhausted myself on the Committee, and I am not disposed to go over what was said there, but I make these statements, thinking they may

illuminate the minds of some of the brethren who are not aware of these basic facts. We are affected with these basic difficulties which we ought to get rid of.

Bishop Denny: I may throw some light on the basic principles. At Chattanooga in 1911, when these suggestions were adopted, we had a request from the Methodist Protestant brethren about this matter of lay representation. We had lay representation in our Church, four laymen from each presiding elder's district, the district being in the hands of the bishop to arrange. The Methodist Episcopal Church had no representation in the Annual Conference. The Methodist Protestant Church had only lay representatives from each pastoral charge. I did not approve the suggestion, as perhaps you may remember, and I do not understand that it was one of the essential facts, but what did constitute the basic element was that there should be lay representation in the Annual Conference, but not the number of the lay representatives. That was not applying to the essence, but to the form, and, so far as I myself was concerned, I frankly told them I could not agree to vote for one lay representative from each pastoral charge and called their attention to the difficulties involved in connection with our own Conference, that a number of us would have to break up our Conferences. We are no longer able to get that large entertainment through the South that we were once able to get, not on account of lack of disposition to give us the old-time hospitality, but because of lack of service. A change in this procedure would not be a breach of faith or agreement with our Methodist Protestant brethren and would not be infringing upon the rights of anybody; and if there be an irreducible minimum in this suggestion, this does not belong to that. We could change it on any basis we please.

Edwin M. Randall: There are some difficulties in this plan that I think we have not contemplated. They were mentioned in Committee, but were not brought up here. For instance, there are difficulties about introducing a membership simply by the election of a delegate from a pastoral charge into a body and membership the large part of which comes of long years of preparation and trial and as the result of the achievement of certain courses of study and the maintenance of character and the commendation that may come from the work that they have accomplished. The mixture of these two sorts of membership is, to my mind, a very radical one. Then, again, this sort of membership that ministers have in the Annual Conference involves certain functions of the Annual Conference that pertain to the ministry alone and in which laity ought not to have any part. On the other hand, it has become just as clear to all of us who are acquainted with the work of the Laymen's Association as it has been developing in our Church that there are various matters which ought to

be discussed and acted upon among our laymen which should be with their coöperation with the ministers in the Church work. It has seemed to me that there was a course that might be pursued that is much more desirable than what is proposed here, and I wish to say for my part I am heartily in favor of the introduction of laymen into the work of our Church in line with the proposal suggested by Judge Rogers. It seems to me that it is a way out of it, one that would conserve all that we have in Laymen's Associations that should be conserved and all that should be conserved in the ministerial conference and that would give all the advantages of coöperation between them. If we should recognize the ministerial conferences, we should also recognize conferences made up of lay representatives from each charge, and it would be substantially making official what we have in our Church in an unofficial way in the Laymen's Association and providing that for certain matters of business, which to my mind should cover everything except those matters in which the laity and the ministry are separately interested—that in all those matters of business they should act in joint session. That would not make any difference whatever in the number of people that would assemble together at the seat of the Annual Conference. It would simply provide that the laity and ministry should sit separately in their respective bodies for each of them to attend to those things in which their order is interested alone and that they should sit together and act together in all those matters in which they are jointly interested and in which we should have joint action. Now, the difficulties that are involved in the plan proposed here would also be involved in the plan I suggest. However, it is my judgment that a further investigation of the situation as it has been carried out in our Church with our lay Conference would diminish the apparent difficulties of entertainment. To my mind, it is quite clear that we shall not be able here in the time we can give to this matter during the remainder of this session to work out these difficulties to our satisfaction, and therefore I move you that this report be recommitted to the Committee to take into consideraion all that has been brought out in this debate.

A Commissioner: Won't that close debate?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Yes, a motion to commit closes debate.

Edwin M. Randall: I wanted to leave the whole matter before us. I move that this subject be recommitted to the Committee to consider this question with all that has been brought out in our discussion and to make a report thereon at our next session.

F. M. Thomas: I move as a substitute for the whole that the clause "one layman shall be elected by the Quarterly Conference

of the charge" shall be stricken out and that we insert "that laymen shall be represented in the Annual Conference and the number be determined by the General Conference."

Bishop Candler: I sympathize with the view of Brother Thomas, but I don't think you can substitute that for a motion to recommit.

Edgar Blake: I am not sure that Brother Randall wanted to preclude any discussion, and I did not hear any second.

H. H. White: I will second it.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You cannot. You have to get the floor before you can second it, and Dr. Blake has the floor.

Bishop Cooke: This was a motion to recommit one thing, which was equivalent to an instruction.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The gentleman who made the motion said that he wanted to recommit all that had been said, and that pertained to a considerable number of things.

Dr. Blake: I want to make two or three suggestions on the amendment of Dr. Ainsworth which provides that the delegates to the Annual Conference shall be elected by the members of the District Conference, one delegate for every one thousand members of the district. Now, there are two or three needs that we ought to keep in mind. I think all of them have been mentioned, and I want to gather them all up together. In the first place, whether it is basic or not, I cannot tell. I only know the language adopted by the Chattanooga Conference, as follows:

We suggest that the Quadrennial Conference shall fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences within their respective jurisdictions and that the Annual Conferences shall be composed of all traveling preachers in full connection therewith and one lay representative from each pastoral charge.

That has been approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and it has been approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in view of that fact the Committee regards it as a fairly safe proposition for us to include that in our proposition here. Now, in view of the fact that the General Conferences of both Churches have provided that there shall be lay representatives from each pastoral charge, I do not see how we can go back on it, though it may be wise to do it. Then there is another item: Take one of the Regional Conferences on the basis of Dr. Ainsworth's amendment. Here is a Conference of 57 ministers and that would have a representation of 4 laymen. No possible equality there; and, to tell the truth, I cannot see very much good that four men would be in an Annual Conference of that kind. Here is a Conference with 105 ministers that would have 9 laymen in it. Brethren, you might as well keep the laymen out of an

Annual Conference as to have such a pigmy representation. Here is a Conference with 111 ministers and that would have 11 laymen. Here is one of 168 ministers which would have 24 laymen. Another of 113 ministers which would have 13 laymen. If you are going to have any lay representation in the Annual Conference, let us have it for an adequate purpose and not for mere show. Let us have enough laymen to be a power or keep them out entirely. In my judgment, that might be what the laymen would prefer. Here is another thing: In large sections of our denomination we do not have District Conferences, although we provide for District Conferences. I fancy if the laity exercise their choice in these matters as in others, the District Conferences will not be created, even though we embody them in our Constitution. I believe it for those reasons and for another reason—namely, that the time has come when the lay representation of our Church, if the Church grows and is to do her full work, and when the entire resources of the Church must be mobilized for the task before us, and that means the introduction into our Annual Conference of the full lay strength of our Church, so far as we can get it. In this connection your Committee simply follows the action of both General Conferences, and we believe we have provided something equitable for all concerned, and for that reason I think the report of the Committee should be approved tentatively until we have greater information and can see exactly what will suit both sides.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: We are within twenty minutes of the time to adjourn, and I move the previous question.

F. M. Thomas: Is my amendment before the house?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Was it seconded?

F. M. Thomas: It was.

A vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The amendment of Dr. Thomas is now before you.

John F. Goucher: I want some information. Why not insert "Regional"?

F. M. Thomas: That is provided for in another section.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Thomas was adopted.

A further vote being taken on the article as amended, the same was adopted.

Edgar Blake: The sixth article reads as follows:

SECTION 1. There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference.

I move its tentative approval.

The motion was seconded.

David G. Downey: Would it not be wiser to read the entire list, so that we would have the whole matter before us?

Edgar Blake: My only reason for not reading them is that it was read once and considered by both commissions. No, it has not been considered. Well, I will read it all:

SECTION 1. There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference:

- (1) Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, inclusive.
- (2) Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and North Carolina, inclusive.
- (3) Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, inclusive.
- (4) Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, inclusive.
- (5) Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, and Alaska, inclusive.
- (6) Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, inclusive.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Does this include the colored membership?

Edgar Blake: No, sir; because the status of the colored members in the reorganized Church was committed to another committee. Now I move the tentative approval of Section 1.

John F. Goucher: I understand we have tentatively approved that first paragraph.

Edgar Blake: Yes.

John F. Goucher: I move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed and referred to a committee to report at the next meeting. I do that for a variety of reasons. There are some very mysterious modifications which should be made in the interest of concentration and homogeneity, in the first place; and, in the second place, I feel that it is very unfortunate for us to settle at this stage the number of regional areas. I think it is very unwise to attempt any solution of Conferences in the regional areas that will create a tremendous amount of friction. The average man will fix his mind on the division of the areas rather than the underlying principle, and the many points of opposition will concentrate and destroy the principle. Therefore I think we ought to spend all of our work on the principles and leave all the applications of details for subsequent consideration and eliminate the necessary points of friction in order to secure the passage of the principle—an unbiased and unprejudiced discussion of the fundamental principle. The question is asked, Why not complete that? Because the mind of the Commission is not fixed. We heard the other day, when the matter came before us for the first time, that several persons rose to say why this particular distribution of Conferences in the regional areas was

not a wise one. There was a tremendous amount of antagonism displayed—because it employed different boundaries from the number of Conferences throughout both of our sections, because these lines are State lines, and a great many Conference lines are not recognized State lines. A large number of Conference lines, strong ones, do not recognize State lines, and whenever a Conference crosses a State line you will have that Conference operating squarely against our work. I think we ought to settle the question at once; and if we adopt the other course, we are simply asking for defeat. I can stand defeat—I have had some experience in that line—but I do not like to invite it.

Bishop Denny: Do these lines cut many of the Annual Conferences?

John F. Goucher: Many of them.

Edgar Blake: Dr. Goucher is evidently in error. You are much mistaken. There are only a few.

John F. Goucher: Nobody is more pleased at being corrected.

Edgar Blake: And no one is more happy to correct you on this matter.

C. M. Bishop: May I have the happiness of being informed whether Regional Conferences will cut across Annual Conference lines?

Edgar Blake: There are only a few places in which the boundaries will be cut.

J. R. Pepper: I know a Conference that has members in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Mississippi.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That is characteristic of the North also.

Edgar Blake: May I call your attention to this fact, that Tennessee is the notable exception. The Holston Conference, Central Tennessee will be affected, and the Holston Conference of Central Georgia will be affected too. Then this other Conference, the Norwegian and Danish Conference, covers from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast.

Bishop Denny: Almost as big as Section 5.

Edgar Blake: Outside of those there are very few, and I think we have done as well as we can do. And let me say this right here: Every time we have come up against a question some brother has said: "Don't bring that up now. That's an encounter opposition." When are we going to get rid of opposition? When can we bring matters up that won't develop opposition? The sooner we bring the Church face to face with these things, the better for all of us concerned. I have sympathy with the desire to keep things away from the Church. If the Church can't be trusted to consider things, those things must be defeated. I tell you the time has come for us to come square up to these things. I don't mean to settle them finally, but

discuss them and reach every conclusion we can on them. Do you think if there is objection to one of the regional lines by a group of Conferences that that objection will be any less in January than it is to-day? I think not. The more time we have to prove to the Church the reasonableness of some of these things, the greater the chances for securing their approval of it.

E. C. Reeves: We will settle that Holston question if we have time enough.

Edgar Blake: If we have time enough? Now, let me say this: Our suggestions as to the boundaries are not ideal by any means. No one is more conscious of the imperfection of this than the Committee which has done this work. I don't think we would have had the temerity to tackle this proposition if the Joint Commission had not instructed us to consider the boundaries. We know this arrangement is not ideal, but the conditions you have to meet in America are not ideal. I mean the geographical distribution of this country is not ideal, and the social and political interests are not ideal for an arrangement of this kind. The only thing we can do is to take what we have and do the best we can. We are going to be crowded in January for time, and mighty important issues are coming up. I am perfectly willing to have this recommitted to the Committee; but, brethren, what is the use of recommitting this to the Committee unless they can have the argument? There is no need of having another Committee working in the dark. Let us have your ideas on the matter of the boundaries.

Edwin M. Randall: I would like to have this go out to the Church, provided it may be understood that at our next meeting this matter would be reopened.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Certainly.

Edwin M. Randall: Out in that little territory of mine there are some very serious problems that it seems to me must be adjusted, and the adjustment of them may require some further action here in some way, and I would be very glad indeed to avail myself of the advice of my brothers out there in regard to these matters if I can only do it, if there is some publicity to this thing, so that I can be prepared with their advice to come up with something constructive in regard to that matter at the next session. My attitude is "absolutely friendly to help put across anything that we can make feasible, if it is not feasible. My attitude is absolutely friendly in trying to find a way out, and I think I will be helped out by publicity between this session and the next, and I want our little territory out there to be taken into consideration most sympathetically by you here because the membership there does not relatively indicate the proportion of consideration we should have as far out as we are on the frontier, as much scattered as we are, with the

few large cities we have. Therefore, applying the principle of Brother Goucher, as much at a disadvantage as we may be as to our vision out there, nevertheless it remains that in our Church north of the Ohio River the largest *per capita* for benevolent purposes is in the Helena area, of which Bishop Cooke is resident bishop; and the second highest *per capita* given for benevolent purposes north of the Ohio River is the San Francisco area; and the third is the Portland area, which I represent. The lowest *per capita* is in the populous country surrounding the Cincinnati area, and the second lowest *per capita* is in the great metropolitan district, where they should have the largest. And in the Cincinnati area the highest *per capita* area is in the Lexington Conference, a colored Conference. Out there we have full-size people doing big business; and although Brother Blake called attention to an unfortunate exception in our constant growth out there, the city I represent and some other cities out there have grown since 1900 from 80,000 to 360,000, and that is not simply Seattle growing, but the whole country is growing that way, and Methodism is growing that way, and we must look ahead, and we must think in this adjustment what a territory like that would be to-morrow. That territory contains forty-six and one-half per cent of the entire area of the United States, and if you include Alaska, which is a part of our region, fifty-five per cent of the entire area. We have problems out there that we have to settle and readjust and handle in such a peculiar way as that in finding a solution for these problems I would be glad to have publicity and a discussion that I will use my influence to make as attractive and as helpful as possible not only in the suggestions that may be made, but in the view of the matters that may be promoted between now and our next session, and I shall be hopeful that at the next session I shall be able to present some suggestions in the way of a solution.

I. G. Penn: I have been voting for everything that we have had under consideration in connection with the Conferences because it referred to the powers, etc.; but when you come down to the number of Regional Conferences we face the fact that you have left out of this arrangement 350,000 *bona fide* members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Brethren, if you are going to postpone this matter of the status of the negro in the reorganized Church and not going to face it at this meeting and decide definitely upon it, you should postpone the number of Regional Conferences. The position I take at this time is the position of the Chattanooga Agreement, and the Chattanooga Agreement suggests that the negro is to have Regional Conferences with representation in the General Conference, and it is not fair until that question is settled to determine the number of Regional Conferences. I have no objection to the postponement of the negro

question until the January meeting; but if that question is to be postponed, this question ought to be postponed, and the number of Regional Conferences ought to be fixed, especially if we are to have these Conferences published in the Church. It ought not to go out with the understanding that 350,000 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been ignored in the arrangement.

Joseph Van Cleve: They live in these States.

I. G. Penn: While we live in these States, there is nothing said in this thing about colored Conferences, and it is understood that the Colored Regional Conference will be a Colored Regional Conference by itself, and this goes out distinctly as a white Conference. Moreover, it has been said upon this floor that this arrangement does not include the 350,000 colored members. Dr. Blake said that, and this matter ought to be postponed if the other matter is to be postponed.

Bishop Hamilton: It is a great deal more to our credit before the whole Church not simply to leave the negro question alone and send that off as though we have debated it and simply say that is the last thing and we didn't want to have any relation to it—it is a great deal better to put this Regional Conference matter over, and I want to indorse what has just been said about putting this Regional Conference over and letting it go with the colored question. Then I want to say that it is wrong to leave the colored brethren out of the Regional Conferences throughout the entire Church. It does intimate on the face of it that you have another opinion for the arrangement of those Conferences, and that is a wrong impression to go out to the Church. You do not want to have it understood that this idea of associated Conferences which has not been discussed at all is in our minds, and we cannot agree to have them in these regions. It is not fair to these members who have sat here, when they ask you whether their case should be included in the Regional Conference, for you to say why, they will have to put up with it, no matter what they think or feel. Thirdly, I am not ready to accept this as the best we can do. You have a good committee. You have a very able brother here. There is no more capable man. I have been standing back of him for twenty years. I nominated him for this place on this Commission because he was the most competent man in New England for the place. Now, look here. Judge Reeves has raised the question that if he were only one man with one opinion and all the rest were against him, I would want to consider it. You have disturbed certain Conferences because they were over the State lines. The first thing that came into my mind was the Erie Conference, part in Pennsylvania, part in Ohio, and part in New York; and if you are going to force this down as adopted tentatively before the Church, it is going to meet a great deal of

opposition. Why not let it go before the Church and get suggestions rather than for this fifty to take the whole Church in our hands and manipulate it as though it were so much clay.

Edgar Blake: The thing that we are desirous of is not to force a thing down the throats of anybody, but instead of having all these glittering generalities that you will criticise the details. That is what we want. We want to know where the weaknesses are in the plan that we have discovered. We want the facts. We want discussion to bring out the objection.

Bishop Hamilton: I have not had time to sit down and go over this business with the figures as you have done, but I am making some criticism. I made one stride and then a second one, and now I am making a third one. You have taken up the work in this country as though it was all in your grasp, and you have distributed these German brethren against their protest into these several Regional Conferences. Isn't there a better way of doing the business? What is the objection when you have a plan of that kind to putting it into the hands of a joint committee that will go over it more carefully than these one or two or ten brethren have done, bringing such a plan up to us for the first time. I would like to take it and go over it in detail, and I have had no opportunity to do that here. What is the objection to laying it over with the negro question? Don't put the negro question off alone when there are so many reasons why this matter should have further consideration. You ought to have it go before the Church in a shape to be considered; but if you send out something that is going to be adopted in January, you will have all sorts of objections. I am ready to offer constructive criticism. When I was a boy, for six weeks I ran a column in the Pittsburgh *Advocate* arguing in favor of conforming the Conference lines to State lines. I think we will come to that, but this is not the way to reach it. I think we can get it in better shape if you leave it to a committee.

Bishop McDowell: I do not know the form of the motion, but I desire to make a single statement in behalf of the Committee. The status of the colored membership in our Church was left to a special committee at the Baltimore meeting. This committee did not feel, therefore, that it could consider that question even in the distribution of the Conferences into Regional groups. The elimination of negro membership both from the statistics and from the distribution was due wholly, in the minds of our Committee, to the fact that that subject of the status and possibly the geographical distribution had gone to another Committee.

Bishop Hamilton: May I ask you a question?

Bishop McDowell: Yes.

Bishop Hamilton: Is it not true that you supposed when any

action was taken that would be final that the negroes would be included in there and that that matter when it came up for discussion would create the Regional Conferences?

Bishop McDowell: If I may answer for myself, we had no idea that this geographical arrangement could finally be disposed of or the whole question of the powers of the Regional Conferences be disposed of finally until the question of the status of the negro and his existence in the Regional Conference or some other should be finally disposed of, and our action was based upon a perfect understanding that it could not complete the whole action of the Joint Commission upon this subject. Is not that right?

Edgar Blake: The only matter was what was referred to. The geographical position of our work was in no way to affect our colored committee's work.

David G. Downey: The motion before us was to refer, and there was no second. I want to say a few things and then amend the motion. Probably the Commissioners will not imagine from what I say that I am in opposition to this plan. I do not know enough about it to be definite in opposition or commendation. It may turn out that I would be perfectly willing to accept these regional divisions. The first point is, we have accepted Section 1, "There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having certain Regional Conferences." We have accepted the number. That is the important thing that may go out to the Church. Now, with respect to these subdivisions, figures are a peculiar thing. They don't just arrange themselves. The moving finger writes, but back of the moving finger there is a human intelligence and a human purpose. The brethren have been at work, and we owe them a debt of gratitude for their industry and patience and self-sacrificing labors. They know just what they are aiming at, and they bring us these figures. Dr. Blake says we ought to make criticisms. Why, brethren, we have only been here three or four days, and in order to make concrete criticism we must sit down with our tables and maps and books of statistics and find out just what this means and find out what newer or better combination we can make. There are no facts in the possession of the ten members who constitute this sub-committee that we ought not to have. We have not committed our judgment entirely to others. They bring us their best reasons and conclusions, and we are grateful, but we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the Church we represent to go carefully and critically into these figures and find out if they are justified and if they are the best that can be. That is why I favor the delay. I favor acceptance of the report, but I favor holding our judgment in abeyance or even the point of tentative approval of this plan. It is always to be borne in mind that there are from 350,000 to 450,000 of our members not included or considered.

Also the Committee itself acknowledges that this is imperfect; it is only tentative; it is confessedly imperfect, and I believe no interest will suffer by delay. Having accepted the principles, we can wait for the details, and therefore I make this suggestion, that we receive this distribution with great interest and that we refer it back to the Committee for further consideration and discussion.

The motion was seconded.

Robert E. Jones: The attitude of the Regional Conferences, their powers, and their boundaries were given to a committee to consider. There was also a committee to consider the status of the negro in the reorganized Church. These two questions relate to one another. In making the number of Regional Conferences we are fixing the boundaries of the Regional Conferences. We are saying that there shall be six Regional Conferences, and the inference is that we are to have six Regional Conferences, but we don't know what we are going to do with the colored man. There are two reports on the status of the negro, a majority and a minority report, neither of which represents our opinion at all. Now, I think it would be exceedingly embarrassing if not unfair if this report goes out in this shape. Our—I started to say our enemies, but I won't say that—but there will be those in the South who will take advantage of this and say that we have been shoved aside and no consideration given. I would prefer, if you do not take up the question in its entirety, that you do not fix the number of Regional Conferences. If you take up the whole question, well and good; face it now. I would as soon face it now as any other time, but I am unwilling that we shall by implication say to the Church that the negro has been shelved or set aside. If you want to accept an amendment to this article and say that there shall be another Regional Conference composed of the colored brethren, I am entirely willing, but I do not think it is treating the question with sufficient importance to dismiss it in this way, and I hope, therefore, that the motion for a postponement or reference to the Committee will prevail.

Bishop McDowell: I was not speaking on the merits of the case before. I was explaining the position of the Committee. Now, I would like to say that this report on other Conferences does not read that there shall be six Regional Conferences. The report purposely was made to read, "There shall be the following Regional Conferences," which in the understanding of the Committee was intended, as I think it is fair to say, to avoid fixing the specific and exact number in order that such additional Regional Conferences as might be ordered after the whole subject came before us in the light of reports from other committees—that additional Regional Conferences might be added, and there

might be eight, but still the heading to our report would stand: "There shall be the following Regional Conferences."

Albert J. Nast: This is a very complicated question. There are ten Annual German Conferences in the United States, numbering about 700 ministers and 65,000 members. They are distributed in these Regional Conferences that have been mentioned here. They have not, however, been considered as we have been informed, just as our colored brethren have not been considered for another reason, but here is an integral element of our ministry and our membership which will be simply swallowed up in this arrangement without any proper representation. Of course we have our Annual Conference delegation in the General Conference, but the Regional Conferences will have very large powers, as we have found it, and to give you an illustration: here in the four Regional Conferences there are, as we have been informed, 4,579 ministers and 1,080,982 members. Of these 4,579 ministers, there are 280 that represent two Conferences and a part of a third that are German Conferences. They would be here constructively, but they would be utterly lost as far as representing their interests was concerned against 4,500 ministers. I could name other illustrations.

Edgar Blake: Is it your desire that our foreign Conferences should be arranged into separate Regional Conferences by themselves? Is that your idea?

Albert J. Nast: No, sir; we have a small membership, and we couldn't have that. It would be preposterous that they should be endowed with the powers of electing bishops, but here is the difficulty. The Methodist Episcopal Church has considered its German work which has grown so marvelously of sufficient importance to give it to a separate General Conference district, as you know, the thirteenth General Conference District, and allied with that our German Conferences in Europe. If we could arrange Regional Conferences by General Conference Districts, we would have a new representation. There, again, my brethren, I appreciate the immense embarrassment and difficulty of this Committee in arranging the geographical bounds of these Regional Conferences. Therefore I would favor postponement of the final settlement and that some arrangement should be made by which that large integral part of the Methodist Episcopal Church should have more specific representation.

Bishop Leete: It is now six o'clock, and we are supposed to have an evening session, and we have developed so many points of difficulty that it is perfectly apparent that we cannot solve them, so I move to adjourn.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: I think the discussion has served its purpose,

and we ask the Commission to recommit. We are not going to get any further on the way by giving this any further discussion.

Bishop McDowell: Was it not recommitted with an idea of having the report at this meeting?

John F. Goucher: Why not vote on the motion to postpone further consideration and recommit?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Dr. Goucher's motion was to refer it to a committee, not back to this Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): How shall the motion be put? Dr. Goucher moved to refer it to a Committee.

David G. Downey: My amendment was that we receive it with interest and that we refer it back to the Committee for further consideration and judgment.

John F. Goucher: If Brother Downey will withdraw the "interest" part of it and let us work on, it might be better.

Bishop McDowell: I would not like to receive it back with instructions to further discuss it. That would be a work of supererogation. -We will probably discuss it anyhow.

Edgar Blake: Considering the amount of work put on us, I want it back with interest.

Bishop Hamilton: I have every confidence in the world in that Committee, but they have given us their idea, and now I wonder if it wouldn't be a good thing to have a new committee.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: And then another one and then another one and so on *ad infinitum*.

Bishop Hamilton: No, I would not object to its going back to this Committee to be considered. If that hadn't been consented to, I would have been compelled to make a motion to have another Regional Conference for the colored people in this country, and I thought it was better for it to go back to the Committee for consideration. I had confidence in that Committee, and they will take into account what we have been saying here, and they will come back with a little different division or an addition to this.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Before this body I would like to call attention to the fact that has been revealed, that the work of the Committee on the Status of the Negro is intimately connected with this, and I think it should be recommitted and that these two committees should be asked to concur with each other.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That would be unwieldy.

A vote being taken on the motion to postpone, it was carried.

W. N. Ainsworth: I want to make a motion regarding our further procedure, that speeches be limited to five minutes for the remainder of the meetings, except that they may be extended by a formal vote.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop McDowell: In order that the Committee to which this

subject has been recommitted may be in a position to handle this matter properly, I move that they be permitted to enlarge the scope of their labors as they may deem necessary.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

P. D. Maddin: I would like to make this motion: It is manifest that this Committee did an enormous amount of work, and especially in the line of their Church statistics, but the details of that information are not before us. I wish to move that the Committee within thirty or sixty days give us the benefit of those details in order that we may have an understanding of the arrangement that they shall make in these Regional Conferences—in other words, that they shall make a report showing the area of each State and Regional Conference and the number of preachers and the number of probationers in each Conference and what Annual Conferences exist in the State and whether any Annual Conference will be split up by this arrangement as suggested, how many members will be affected in each subdivision, and how many colored members are in each State and in each Regional Conference, and how many colored Conferences and the number of preachers and members.

Bishop McDowell: That would be an immense amount of toil, but I would be willing to accept it in behalf of the Committee with this understanding: that we should only present those figures when we can get them ready, but I wouldn't like to be compelled to have it done on such and such a day.

Edgar Blake: I move that the whole matter be left to a new committee. [Laughter.]

The motion of Bishop McDowell was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Denny: I rise to ask a question. The motion of Bishop McDowell was adopted. Does that mean that there are two committees?

Bishop McDowell: No, sir; it was not intended to refer to the Committee on Conferences at all the status of the negro, but in case this committee wants to submit back geographical specimens of what Regional Conferences would be composed of the colored Conferences, that it shall not be regarded as an impropriety if it does permit it.

Bishop Hamilton then pronounced the benediction, and the Joint Commission adjourned.

NIGHT SESSION

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Cranston.

The hymn "My Faith Looks Up to Thee" was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brother Neff will lead us in prayer.

Frank Neff: Our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the faith we have in our Lord Jesus Christ; we thank thee for One who knows all about our needs, for One who has walked along the way full of difficulty, for One who was tempted at all points like as we are; and, O God, we thank thee that He walked without sin. We are glad that we can come to thee through him, glad that we can walk with thee from day to day, glad that thou dost not leave us to walk alone and, groping, find our own way, but that thou art with us. And we are so glad not only for the personal privilege of having Jesus Christ as our Saviour, but we are so glad that he is the Saviour of the whole world and so glad for the privilege of telling the story of it, so glad for the Church thou hast given us and for our own Church that has meant so much in the lives of so many men and women, this great Church, O God, which has meant so much to us personally. We are grateful that thou hast given us a place to labor, and we pray thy blessing upon us in all the work in the Church and in the kingdom. We do not ask it for selfish purposes, but we ask it for Jesus's sake and for the sake of this kingdom on earth that thou wouldst help us as a Church to be strong in thee and in the power of thy blessed love that Jesus only can give, that we may be more and more a quickening power and means for the salvation and the upbuilding and the increasing of a multitude of men. Bless us here to-night and keep us close to one another and close to thyself and close to our work in the name of our dear Master. And, O God, forgive us our sins. Keep us from sin. May we be pure and clean of heart and may our lives be such that they will redound to the honor and glory of thy name so that thou mayest be able to say to us each day, "Well done," and the highest thing we can ask is that we may be acceptable in thy sight and not of ourselves, but for Jesus's sake. Amen.

The minutes of the last session were read.

Bishop Denny: It is a mistake to say that I rose to a question of personal privilege. I rose to correct one word in the minutes. I want that statement that I rose to a question of personal privilege corrected. In my motion with reference to Senator Fairbanks I said we regretted that Senator Fairbanks was compelled to leave, but that I moved that permission be given.

Bishop Cooke: To have an accurate report on the matter of voting in State Conferences, attention was called to the fact that no age limit was in any part of the article or section we were considering, and I made an amendment that there be a qualification, which Dr. Ainsworth accepted.

Secretary Thomas: Dr. Lamar.

Dr. Cooke: No, Dr. Ainsworth accepted it. I offered an amendment that there be an age qualification for the Annual

Conference. We went back by common consent to Section 2 and without a formal vote for reconsideration.

Secretary Thomas: Dr. Lamar offered the amendment.

Bishop Cooke: No, Dr. Ainsworth offered it.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Let the correction be made; and if there are no other corrections, the minutes will be approved as corrected.

Bishop McDowell: I will revise a statement I made this afternoon and ask for leave of absence after nine o'clock or thereabouts to-night. I think it may not be amiss to say that the problem of the chaplaincies for the army and navy is of very serious proportions. If matters go through as they are now projected, our Church will be obliged to add forty additional men by the 15th of August, and you will have to have twenty-four or twenty-five in addition to those you have already presented, and I have a meeting of the Committee on Chaplaincies on Friday of this week, and I have made no preparation, and I have to get to Washington to go over the papers, and I would like to be excused after nine o'clock to-night.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Without objection the request will be granted.

Bishop Denny: May I put in a personal request? I find that one of my children is quite sick and away from home, and I know if I leave to-night, owing to engagements that have been outstanding for a long time, I cannot get home until about the 1st of August. I think I ought to go home for a few hours before going farther south. I have never before asked for relief from any such service as this, but I feel that I ought to start home to-night, and I trust the Commission will grant me the privilege.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): If there is no objection, the leave will be granted.

Bishop Hamilton: I have announced so many times that I am going that it looks like a work of supererogation to ask for leave of absence.

Bishop McDowell: I move that this third farewell appearance of Bishop Hamilton be approved.

Bishop Mouzon: I think no service less important than this should have called me away from home at this time, and I ask leave of absence after this evening.

Bishop McDowell: I think we ought to assure Bishop Denny, who speaks of the illness of his family, and Bishop Mouzon, of the illness of whose wife we know, our abiding sympathy and our earnest prayers for the lives of those dearest to them, and I so move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop McDowell: I now move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet on the 27th day of December, which is a few

days after Christmas. Christmas comes on Tuesday, and Thursday is about the best day we could have for a meeting; and if I could make a further motion, I would refer the place of meeting to the Chairmen of the two Commissions with a very strong leaning toward New Orleans.

W. N. Ainsworth: In that connection I would like to extend the Commission an invitation to hold the next meeting in the city of Savannah. There is no city, with the possible exception of the city of Baltimore, which has quite so much of historic interest to American Methodists as the city of Savannah. It is the spot on which John Wesley first set his foot on American shores and was the scene of his labors for about two years. Every one of the places in which he resided or had his ministry is marked by a bronze tablet. Savannah was the base from which George Whitefield conducted his great revivals. His House of Mercy still exists about ten miles below the city and throws its sheltering arms about fifty boys who otherwise would be homeless. You can come to Savannah from New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Washington in two hours less time than you can reach Atlanta from the same territory. You can reach it from the West through Atlanta over the Central of Georgia Railway, which furnishes as good service as any railroad in that part of the country. You will not be called to go over side lines of railroads, but you will go on trunk lines and Pullmans. This body can be entertained in the corner of any one of three hotels, any one of which can furnish service that will meet the most exacting demands of any man on this Commission. I hope that the Joint Commission will see its way clear to meet in Savannah.

Bishop Mouzon: Since it seems to be the policy of the Commission to meet in far-away places, places that are difficult of access, I would put in nomination a city. The climate will be delightful in the winter time, but it will be just as difficult of access as Savannah or Traverse City. I nominate Brownsville, Tex.

W. N. Ainsworth: Savannah is not to be put in the same class with Traverse City. You don't travel over any such line of railroad as the Pere Marquette or Grand Rapids. Every railroad that comes into Savannah is far and away above those roads.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no motion before the house.

Bishop McDowell: I suggest that the Chairmen get together and fix the place.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): If you will excuse me, if you make it the 27th of December, it will have some pressure on the business men. That is a very unreasonable time for them to meet with us. If you will meet the 10th of January, everybody

will have the New Year's work out of the way, and we could be more deliberate in our discussions.

Bishop McDowell: I am perfectly willing.

H. H. White: As Bishop McDowell has included in his motion the city of New Orleans, I want to say as a citizen of Louisiana and well acquainted with all its cities that I recommend to the kindly attention of the two Chairmen the advisability of meeting in New Orleans. It is, of course, not necessary to say that the lines of communication to New Orleans are good and that the hotel accommodations are sufficient. It is a place where the Latin and Anglo-Saxon meet, and it would be a good place for a strong body of Methodists to entertain themselves, and you will be well entertained if they can assemble there.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion of Bishop McDowell was to fix December 27.

H. W. Rogers: Would not a number of the Commissioners be seriously inconvenienced if we meet on the 27th of December?

Bishop Candler: I think so. I myself have business that would demand my attention.

T. N. Ivey: I will move as an amendment that we make it January 9.

John M. Moore: Could we not put it January 3? I have an engagement about January 10.

Bishop Candler: As far as I am concerned, I can get my affairs in shape.

John M. Moore: I would like for it to be put at the earliest possible date in January. If January 3 would be acceptable to the rest, it would be acceptable to me. December 27th would be acceptable to me. Mr. Kinne has just stepped out for a moment, but our Conference meets about the middle of January, and it would suit us better to have this Commission meet earlier in January. I move to amend by making it January 3.

C. M. Bishop: I understood Dr. Goucher was tied up with engagements until about the 11th of January.

John F. Goucher: The foreign missions meet the first week in January.

John M. Moore: No, sir; the second.

John F. Goucher: The university meeting is just before that, and the Board of Trustees—

Bishop Candler: How would January 16 or 17 suit you all?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion before the house is for January 3.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Bishop Candler: I hope that will not interfere with the lawyers who have court duties, Judge Rogers and Mr. Maddin.

Bishop Cooke: That is just what it does to Judge Rogers.

H. W. Rogers: That is about the time our court commences.

I do not want to interfere with any of your plans; but the 27th is an unfortunate day for you, and it is about the only fortunate day for me, but I shall not stand in the way of your arrangements. It is not very probable that I shall be at the meeting if you have it along in the middle of January.

Bishop Candler: Suppose we put it January 23 or even as late as the 30th.

David G. Downey: I want to raise a question as to whether it is necessary for us to wait until January. Your General Conference comes in May, and the time between January and May is not very long. I myself hoped that some arrangement might be made for meeting in September. I do not know whether that interferes with Conferences or makes it impossible, but certainly if we do not meet until January we ought all to plan so that we could stay ten days on the business.

Bishop Hamilton: All the bishops will be engaged in Conferences in September.

F. M. Thomas: Why could we not meet the last week in January?

David G. Downey: That is too far off.

Edgar Blake: I feel as Dr. Downey does, that we are running some risk in delaying the time of the next meeting. Would it not be possible to meet in November? Are not all the Conferences over by the 13th of November?

Bishop Candler: No; they occupy September, October, and a larger part of December.

A. J. Lamar: They start from the 12th of August and run to the 17th of December.

Edgar Blake: We are wasting a lot of time over this matter.

F. M. Thomas: I move in order to try out the sentiment of the body, because as Secretary I saw that some men were crowded to get home from Baltimore, and I believe unless there is some very serious conflicts the last week in January will be the better time; so I move that we meet the last week in January.

A. J. Lamar: Could we meet December 15?

Bishop Leete: December would be very unfortunate. Some of us have Conferences in December, and in Atlanta the Sunday meetings will be on. Besides, just before the holidays is bad for business men.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I would like to suggest we make the date the 12th of December.

Bishop Candler: There will be any number of Conferences running then.

John M. Moore: No, sir; the Conferences will be closed.

Edgar Blake: Brethren, we have some very important matters, and we are wasting an immense amount of time over a small matter. I don't believe we can come to an agreement on this to

please everybody. You seem to be entertaining a motion to take the place of the one that is carried. I want to move that the matter of the place and all be left to the Chairmen and the Secretaries of the two Commissions.

Bishop McDowell: Is it not better to agree here?

Edgar Blake: But we don't seem to be able.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion has been carried to make it January 3.

John M. Moore: May we just feel out that matter a little? If we want to agree on any other date, we can rescind that action. Would December 13 be satisfactory to everybody? Is there anybody who could not come on December 13? That is Thursday, and all the Conferences of our Church will have closed on Monday.

Secretary Harris: I am afraid that that conflicts with the Board of Education, which Bishop McDowell and myself have to attend.

Bishop Candler: What is the objection to making it the 23d of January?

Edgar Blake: If we put it late in January and we come to conclusions that are satisfactory, we shall probably have another meeting to shape up everything, and that would come so close to our General Conferences that we would not get ready for it.

C. M. Bishop: Dr. Blake said the last week in January would not suit.

Edgar Blake: O, I can meet on the 23d of January.

Bishop Candler: Would the 16th suit you better?

Secretary Harris: The 13th of December comes in the middle of our Board of Education.

F. M. Thomas: I move that we change the date from January 3 to January 23.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

H. H. White: I rise to a question of privilege. Judge Walton handed me this letter and asks that I present it before the Committee.

The letter was read, as follows:

I regret that I must leave this afternoon on important business that cannot be postponed; but before leaving I desire to say to you, as I have heretofore done, that I fully concur in the minority report of the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church, and I will thank you to so represent my views. I do not favor that unification which provides a plan for the exercise of legislative functions in the Judicial Council by the negro, though this representation be by an apparently small minority. I am yours very truly, etc.

H. H. White: As part of my statement and in view of certain statements made this afternoon by Bishop Hamilton, it occurs to me that it will be exceedingly unwise for us to ad-

journ this session providing for another to be held some time in January without making the people of our respective Churches entirely acquainted with the issues that have arisen here and the conclusions that have been tentatively reached and the matter that still remains for determination. I believe it was Lincoln who said : "You can fool all the people some of the time and fool some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." I do not know but that that remark is particularly applicable here. I am thoroughly of the view that the advice of the people themselves and the appeal to the people themselves is wise, and I believe the great judgment of that portion of the American people which constitutes the great Northern Methodist Church and the great Southern Methodist Church would be of value to us. I have heard it said here that there ought to be a time for ripening, and what we do here should be allowed to ripen, and that public sentiment, North and South, will help to reach conclusions; but I do not know how that public sentiment, North and South, can be guided unless the public is put in possession of the facts and the issues really before us. So far as I understand, there are three schools of thought. One seems to be that there should be unification on the basis purely of the white Church in all particulars. Another, that there should be unification on the basis of negro representation, not in the legislative councils, but in some sort of a judicial tribunal, a modified, limited representation on their part, giving them a part of a loaf, but not all. Then the other is that which is advocated by Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn, which, I understand, calls for their full virile rights, man for man and individual for individual, in the Church to which they belong. Now, there have been two reports of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Unified Church, a majority report and a minority report. There have always been divergences of opinion on other questions here. It is true, perhaps, that progress has been made along the line of the arrangement of Conferences. Perhaps progress could be made if we had to consider it along the lines of the judicial tribunal. Be that as it may, my view is that the whole record ought to be laid before the people. Let the report gotten out by the Committee be published and be made as public as possible through both Churches. Let this very able report on the judiciary be published; and, above and beyond all, let the reports, majority and minority, on the status of the negro be published. I came here thinking that I perhaps understood the sentiment of the people upon the subject. I am advised by some of my friends that I am mistaken. I feel that on an issue so great as that, one which we all approach with timidity and one which we have put into the background until other things are settled, ought to be laid before the people, so that they may express themselves. I

would like for the Southern Conferences which meet during the months of November and December to have an opportunity to express themselves on that subject and to express themselves intelligently, and with that end in view, if it is a proper motion to make at this time, I move that publicity be given to the proceedings of this Commission up to this time, including the minutes of the Commission and the report of the Committees.

The motion was seconded by several.

Bishop Mouzon: I feel it my duty to say that, in my judgment, if you wish to make perfectly sure that the unification of Methodism is to be defeated, you could not adopt any plan that would be more successful than this plan just suggested of publishing in full our tentative findings, together with the minutes of this meeting. I say again, if it is our desire to prevent for many years to come unification of Methodism, we could not possibly think of a surer way of doing it than giving a detailed report of our tentative findings to the public. Now, there is one serious difficulty before us, and that is the status of the colored membership in the reorganized Church. I don't see my way over that difficulty. You don't see your way over that difficulty. I do not believe that a majority vote would be possible in either Commission. Serious difficulties confront the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and just as serious difficulties confront the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There are some things we would like to do, and you tell us we cannot do those things. There are some things which you desire to do, and we tell you we cannot possibly do these things. I do not know what the solution of that question is going to be. God knows. There may be no solution of that question, but I am willing to think over it and pray over it, and you are willing to think over it and pray over it. God may open up a way somehow. I trust that he will. I am sure that we will follow his leadership and his will will be done. Now, there is one serious difficulty that is before us. If you now publish what we have tentatively agreed upon touching the Regional Conferences and their powers, the Church papers all over the connection will shoot our report all to pieces. Unquestionably they will be finding flaws here and offering objections there and bring on a storm of debate all over your Church just as soon as you do that, North and South; and if you publish the report in detail, instead of having one grievous difficulty before us you will have all sorts of grievous difficulties.

T. N. Ivey: You are speaking of the publication in detail.

Bishop Mouzon: Yes; and we must make a detailed report. We are servants of the General Conferences of our Churches. The report to be formulated is to be given to our General Conferences and acted upon by our General Conferences, and it has

never been customary for such commissions as this to give to the public its report before it presents its report to the General Conferences. I view with considerable concern the proposal to make public our findings before we have presented our findings to the General Conference. I wish some strong and definite and encouraging statement might be given to the Church that we have made some progress, and we have made much progress, that we put behind us difficulties that loomed large before us when we were in Baltimore, that we are earnestly considering these other difficulties. The Church is entitled to know that, but I do not believe it is wise or that it would be a parliamentary proceeding to give to the public press our report before we have presented it to the General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: I intimated this afternoon what I now wish to say more fully. I think we are all gratified, and I think many of us are surprised at the number of things upon which we have come to a tentative agreement and tentatively approved, but no single report has been adopted or approved even tentatively in its entirety. We have not only left the very large colored question, the status of the negro, untouched, but this afternoon when we came up against the geography of the Regional Conferences, we found that an almost insuperable barrier and let that hang in the air, and that before we got through, in connection with our work in foreign-speaking Conferences in its relation to other features of reorganization, still constitutes a problem of tremendous magnitude. If we were to conclude everything else and with everything else tentatively agreed to and settled except the negro question, we would be in a very different state from what we are. But we haven't settled everything. We have tentatively settled a limited number of very important things, for which we are all exceedingly thankful, but these are related even in the reports we have considered to vital features not yet considered, and those are related to all the items we have already considered, and nothing could be more unfortunate in my judgment than to put out an incomplete, imperfect tentative agreement and thus expose what we have already done as a part of our journey to a discussion that would be inevitable and which would go to a point I believe of ruining the whole business. Furthermore, I do not think it would conduce to the peace of either of the Churches just now to put these matters before them just because we haven't the whole scheme to put forth. I would go so far as to say that if in January we can make a fairly substantial agreement upon the whole scheme, even though we are obliged to state that one feature of it or two features of it are not quite worked out, I would prepare that report in full, and for the benefit of the delegates to the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in May, I would print it a month before

the Conference meets, in order that they may have it before them that length of time; but I would not now do anything more than report to the Churches that we have been together in prayer and candor and in sincerity and in diligence and that we have tentatively agreed upon many matters, grave matters, and that other matters—not one matter, but other matters—of grave importance remain unconsidered and undecided, and report progress to the Church and with gratitude announce to the Church that we have not simply had a good sentimental meeting, but have reached certain conclusions of a tentative sort; but these are all related to others, and it is not to the interest of the cause that we have at heart to throw out this tentative and partially complete matter until we are prepared to submit it all. I believe that is fair to the Church.

Bishop Denny: I second that resolution, because it ought to be adopted. I am quite positive in my opinion it ought to be adopted. We are not here representing ourselves. There is not a man of us here who has any more right to know what we have done than any other men in the Church. They are just as much interested and just as much responsible to the Church as we are. Now, our Annual Conferences are coming on and other Conferences that precede the General Conference, and the rank and file of our men have a right to know just the status of the case. They have a right to discuss it. It will not be right to them to withhold the information that we have. We must not throw our Church into a General Conference without opportunity to know and discuss what has been done. I could not ask my brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church to take a position of that kind if they were on the eve of a General Conference, and they have made provision for another meeting before the Conference is through, and we have passed more than a year since your General Conference came on. I could not vote for the statement made at Baltimore, and I didn't vote for it. I couldn't vote for it because it didn't say anything, and I didn't want such a thing to go out. The Senate of the United States is not able to keep its proceedings secret. They put men under personal obligation not to reveal what occurs in executive sessions, and they cannot keep it quiet. Do you think that you can put more than fifty persons in possession of things and not have them known? It is not possible to do it. All these things will go out in some garbled form. They are bound to get out. We had a little meeting last summer at Tate Springs, and a fairly correct report of that meeting was published all over the country with the details and personalities in it. How it got out I have not the least idea, but it got out. There were only nine men there. Some things should not have been published. Publicity is not a thing that cures all evil. But we cannot keep these things to ourselves, and we ought

not to want to keep them; and whatever we have done, the report we have presented and the actions we have taken ought to be given to the Church, and particularly because our branch of the Church is about going into General Conference, and it has a right to know all there is to be known that it may give such instructions as it cares to give, and it is not right for any Annual Conference in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to withhold from that General Conference all the facts known and so shut off from their brethren all knowledge of what has been done and any assurance from their brethren as to what they wish to be done. We have had a referendum in Methodism since we began. Everything goes back to the members of the Conference in full connection. Why should we withhold from them? The thought of defeating the matter hadn't occurred to me. I was simply thinking of the rights of the brethren. I remember on one occasion it was suggested, and this is the ninth of these meetings we have held with our brethren of the Northern Church—

H. H. White: The thought of defeat was not in my mind.

Bishop Denny: I believe it was at Ocean Grove that one member said we must not let it be given out, and one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church said there are editors in our Church and elders in our Church who are just as much entitled to know these things as we are, and I attended to that, though I had said nothing up to that time. That is the case now, and I don't think you have any right to say to any man in here that he shall not say to the men just as much interested as he what has been done here. Suppose I meet Bishop McCoy or Bishop Waterhouse or Bishop Kilgo. I believe those men have a right to everything I know. Suppose I meet any of the men not in the episcopacy, men whose interest in the Church is just as deep as mine, men whose responsibility is fully as much as mine. Haven't they a right to know what has taken place?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Five minutes is up, and I recognize Bishop Cranston.

Bishop Cranston: If this were a matter of putting before the Church a correct portrayal of what has transpired and the spirit that has characterized our sittings and in which we have met each other in the effort to meet with the difficulties which exist on both sides, that would be conceivable, provided it were conceivable that such a thing could be done. We all recognize that it is impossible, that the sentiment that prevails here, the operations of the Spirit of God upon our own hearts, the results of our mutual interchange of thoughts and feelings cannot be transmitted to the masses of the two Churches, and we stand in an attitude peculiarly difficult. From your side you contemplate the obstacles that inhere in the opinion held by your people with reference to the colored man and what should be his status in the

Church. On our side it is not a matter of opinion that must be met. I ventured to say the last time our Commission was together, when somebody said our brethren of the South ought to know our views, I ventured to say it was not a matter of views. It is not a question of what opinion we may hold. We have a natural condition that is beyond the control even of the General Conference. We have 350,000—340,000, at any rate—negro members. I will not rehearse the case; you know it thoroughly. What 340,000 members in your Church would you venture to exclude by act of the General Conference? How would you go about it? What would you do, no matter if you wanted to rid yourselves for some valid reason of those memberships or even of 100,000—how would you go about it? As you men perceive, the situation is one beyond control. Nobody can work out this problem along questions of authority. It must have time. Our brothers of color must have time to consider. You may say they have had time. Who shall compel them to consider? Now, I apprehend as this matter goes out and as you come to meet your people in your General Conferences questions will arise as to what is the attitude of our brethren in the North—what do they say, and what do they propose? What under heaven can we propose? The situation is not, I say again, within the domain of propositions. Here are facts that we cannot get away from. Our General Conference has expressed no desire to rid ourselves of these colored people whom we have been gathering in all these years. Our Commission cannot do anything. I make no appeal for justice. I have no fear of any injustice from any man on this Commission, but I do feel that I am warranted in asking that our brethren of the South will lay the facts before their brethren so that it may be made very clear to your brethren that the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church is not obstinately standing in the way of an agreement concerning the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that we are just where we were and are not blamable that we are not elsewhere. Now, we cannot make an apology for what we have done to the colored people. You would not have us, you would be ashamed of us. I do not know but what you would spurn any thought of uniting with us if we were to get up and say we have made a mistake. [The time of the speaker here expired.]

Bishop Leete: I would like to hear Bishop Cranston very much, but we have adopted rules—

P. D. Maddin: I will give Bishop Cranston my time.

Frank Neff: That would not be fair to take the time of one of the Southern members. Let him take my time.

Bishop Cranston: I simply want, for the sake of a clear understanding, to set before you, not the attitude of our Com-

mission in the matter of entering into diplomatic exchange of this great undertaking, but simply when the matter of procedure has been predicated, when your brethren proposed this arrangement and I proposed united action, there were many geographical areas to be considered; and when we came to the Chattanooga Conference and to the suggestions that emanated from that body and from that time down to the present, it has been the complete understanding in our Church that the aim of all these propositions and the hope for outcome of all these negotiations was to bring about such a form of government as would make it possible for the brethren in the Southern regions to control their internal Church affairs entirely, not with reference to excluding the colored man, but to make such arrangements as would accommodate his presence and permit that work which we had commenced among the colored people to be carried forward. That has been the understanding all the way through. There was no other thought about these divisions or Regional Conferences. There were other thoughts, of course, but this was the dominating thought all the time. Now, we are up to the point where we have it settled that there are Regional Conferences, the Chattanooga understanding by which the colored brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church were to be accommodated in the Regional Conferences. I grant Bishop Denny did not vote for it, but there was no opposition to it, and it went before your General Conference. After that time and again it was put before us that the Chattanooga agreement had been offered us. Of course it was offered us, and when our General Conference met we could not do any more than to prepare a proposition which was debated at Oklahoma City. The time is coming when, if the motive of the American people entering into this war shall be made productive of its natural fruitage, men of all colors will meet without challenge on account of race or previous condition and when they will sit together. The democracy of the world that had its inspiration in the teachings of Jesus Christ can comprehend nothing less than a universal brotherhood of all nations. If there is to be a parliament of men, all men will be in it. It may come with the great movement of population that our legislators will be compelled to sit in council with colored men. A big influx here or there may put a great black constituency in some place, and your representatives will sit in Congress with representatives of those black people, and they will be in your legislatures. Can't you understand that? For God's sake, for Christ's sake let not the politicians get ahead of the Christian Church in making good on the teachings of Jesus Christ concerning the civil rights of man and concerning the realization of those

rights. I do not claim that in Church membership a man acquires any peculiar rights ecclesiastical. Those rights come by constitutional endowment, and by constitutional endowment these men have certain rights. I think you should get back to the idea underlying the organization of the Church, the spiritual conception of the mission and being of the Church of Christ; but until that time comes we must accommodate ourselves to circumstances. Brethren, we want to go forward with these negotiations. Somehow or other we have faith that God, who has led us thus far, will so impress our people on both sides that at last in a way we cannot perceive we shall consistently become one great army for deliverance of the world in this time of the world's unparalleled bondage.

F. M. Thomas: I have a motion that I think should come at this time.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): There is a motion before the house.

F. M. Thomas: My motion is that the Secretaries be instructed to print the minutes in condensed form and that each Commission shall be the judge in reference to publicity.

Bishop Leete: I second that motion.

E. C. Reeves: I was just studying while this discussion was going on, and I happen to be honored with a seat in our next Annual Conference, which convenes in October, and they will want to know the status of things here in reference to these matters. Now, what can I say? Shall I say we have had our sessions, but I must not divulge anything done here? What am I to do? Will they submit to it? Brethren, we might as well put before our people the question that is before us here now and let them act upon it. It is a question of whether or not in this reorganization the negro is going to be in or out, and we might as well stand up and face the question. That doesn't mean that we will have any feeling against the negro.

F. M. Thomas: A point of order: The discussion is on a question not before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The point is well taken. We are now on the question of publishing the minutes.

H. H. White: I think Judge Reeves has a right to reply to Bishop Cranston.

Albert J. Nast: Taking advantage of an interruption, I would like to ask leave of absence for the rest of the session. It is absolutely necessary for me to be back on account of the paper I edit. My assistant has gone on a vacation, and I must be there.

Edwin M. Randall: A question of personal privilege also. It is only at great risk of very important matters that I can

stay until to-morrow. I was going to take that risk if there would be a general acquiescence and if we would have something like a full joint session, but under the circumstances I do not feel justified in remaining longer than to-morrow. It would be extremely embarrassing to my business, and I ask to be excused.

The leaves of absence were granted.

Edwin M. Randall: I wish to add this word, that I am delighted at the increased fellowship that has come with renewed association and the increased love that I have found growing in my own heart for the brethren of the Church, South, and my utmost gratification at the progress we have made—progress, to my mind, not represented by what we have done, but what we are capable of doing and by what has come in our own thoughts and minds that I am very sure will enable us to discharge a great deal more business when we meet the next time, just as this time we have done much more than would have been possible at the last meeting last January.

Bishop Cooke: Inasmuch as so many seemingly change their minds, I move to reconsider the motion concerning the meeting to-morrow and that we adjourn to-night.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I cannot entertain that motion at this time. We have a motion before us.

Bishop Leete: I want to move that Mr. Reeves be heard. Dr. Nast had to break in by reason of the fact that he had to go. We have extended men's time from time to time when they have spoken a good deal over ten minutes, and Mr. Reeves has said very little, and I think we should give him an opportunity to say what he wants to now.

Frank Neff: I think we should hear the gentleman, whether it is out of order or not.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): The motion is to extend the time of Mr. Reeves.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Go on, Brother Reeves.

E. C. Reeves: I shall not say much. I had a great big speech to make, but I haven't got the time to make it now. My view about this thing is probably a little different from that of any one else here. I think these colored brethren are entitled to be in the Church and entitled to every privilege every man in the Church has. You can't make a half brother. You can't get along with half privileges. I stand here on the platform of my Church, and I say I believe it is better for him to be in an independent Church, where he can develop himself, where he can rely upon himself, and he will make more out of himself than if he remains as a minority of our

great Church. We will never get along with him on earth in the Church if we say he is not entitled to every privilege that every other man has. He is just as much entitled to the privilege as I am or you or anybody else. He is entitled to every privilege in the Church, and I think it is better that the two races should be separate absolutely than to have the colored man in the Church with half privileges. Now, I have an opinion that amounts to a conviction. We don't want to use the word "ultimatum" here, but if there was not an ultimatum put up by my good friend I don't know what an ultimatum is. It is as much of an ultimatum as I ever heard, and if that wasn't one I wouldn't know an ultimatum if I met it in the road. What are we going to do? We are going to have two Churches. He must be in the same Church with the same rights and the same privileges, or we must be separate. We cannot get along any other way. This question should be put squarely before our Conferences and let them instruct us what to do. My Conference down there ought to know just what questions are before this body and ought to instruct its delegates according to what the General Conference thinks is best, so that they may act wisely and properly represent their constituents. So I say it is better for them to know the whole thing than to get part of it incorrectly.

H. M. Du Bose: Before making my statement, I want to ask Bishop Cranston a question. I understand the debated question is a matter of giving information to our Churches, and I want to know of Bishop Cranston if he favors giving our Churches full information.

Bishop Cranston: If we could put an exact statement of the situation before the Churches, I would favor it. I said what I said in the way of expressing a great big question as to the possibility of doing that thing, and I cited our own difficulty as one almost impossible of understanding by the masses of the people at large.

H. M. Du Bose: Would you object to a general statement before the Churches?

Bishop Cranston: I would welcome a statement prepared by two or three men on each side.

H. M. Du Bose: I am convinced that some form of statement should be made to our Churches. I don't think it ought to go to the extent of giving the details of the minutes *in extenso*, but there should be some comprehensive statement made to the Churches and made immediately for various reasons. There will be discussion of this matter in the papers of the Church next week, and the viewpoint will be such as the writers of the articles get from chance information. I believe I favor this as a substitute for all matters before the

456 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

house: Resolved, That it be the sense of this Commission that a report be made to our Churches upon so much of the plan for unification as has been favorably passed upon at this sitting, the form of this report to indicate that the final agreement is contingent upon the action taken upon the negro question. Resolved, That a committee consisting of four members of this Commission be appointed to frame that report.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We have a substitute pending now. You can give notice that you will move that at a later period.

H. M. Du Bose: All right.

John F. Goucher: What is the matter before the house?

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Brother White moves that the minutes be published of what has been done and that a report be made. Dr. Thomas offered as a substitute, seconded by Dr. Leete, that the Secretary be instructed to print the minutes in condensed form, the Commission to be the judge of what shall be printed.

John F. Goucher: I cannot find it in my judgment to approve of the substitution, nor do I approve of the original motion in its entirety. I want to say concerning the substitute that it would be better to print the whole minutes than an epitome made by one man or two men.

F. M. Thomas: We mean to leave out the speeches.

John F. Goucher: I do not believe in a condensation that takes the matter out in its entirety and is therefore not accurate. I, therefore, cannot approve of that. Again, we have neither responsibility for nor right to make any partial report to our Churches or to any part of our Churches. The General Conferences unitedly instructed us to prepare a plan and report back to the General Conference. They did not instruct us to report to any Annual Conference or to the Church at large. Now, we are not obeying our instructions; we are guilty of courtesy; we are disobeying our commission. I cannot see any argument that it is necessary that the Annual Conferences shall know what has been done so that they can properly instruct us. The General Conference took that out of the hands of the Annual Conference in my judgment and put it in the hands of a Joint Commission to settle this question at this time, and the Annual Conferences nor the papers have any interest in it. It is not to ignore them in the least. It is not at all to interfere with their rights. It is not an attempt to put something over upon them. It is that this Commission without the appearance of prejudice or pressure went all through the ramifications of the argument, following wherever it may lead, and have formed their conclusions of a plan to be presented to the General Conference. If we attempt to

do anything else, we are doing something not proper. Further in this connection I want to say that we shall not have anything to report, because nothing has been determined except tentatively and that dependent on some other things. We could not think of reporting to them the reports that have come to us that have not been considered. Therefore there should be some modification of the resolution. I am not desirous of keeping the Church in the dark. I do not know how we can do it; but it is one thing for the Commissioners to talk about a thing that occurred unofficially and a very different thing for the Commission to interpret itself inadequately. We are making progress, but we cannot give details, because the measures are only tentatively approved. They may be modified by other discussion. Therefore I think the best thing is simply to have this report printed as suggested without any attempt at making any statement to the public or to the Church or anybody until we have completed our work and then make a report to the General Conference. I dare say that this Commission is quite competent to make such a report to their fellows as would interpret their desires and their ideas.

Bishop Cranston here took the chair as presiding officer.

Bishop Candler: The Bishop will recall that there was a call from one Annual Conference that the sessions of this Commission should be open. I do not think the sessions should be open. It was given out that the sessions would be open but for the opposition of the bishops on the side of the Southern Methodist Commission. I think this Commission will understand that was just a shade more than an inaccurate statement. One other statement: I have not felt since entering upon the labors of this Commission that it was quite the thing to go into the papers and discuss matters, but a number of members on the Commission have felt that they were justified in doing that. I did write an article before I was on the Commission, but since I have kept silent; but a statement went out last night that even members of this Commission interpreted differently. One member gave a very glowing account of what we did at Baltimore, and another member said we didn't do anything. Dr. Goulier has said to us very truly that we cannot be sure what will go out. That is true, but we can make it accurate. Another statement a little off the question. I am not in this matter concerned about the status of the negro in the United Church: but when the Chattanooga agreement was reached, the principle of Regional Conferences or Jurisdictional Conferences or Quadrennial Conferences was said to be a recommendation of three or four; the number has now risen to six. It carries with it

divers conferences that I need not suggest to men of your ability. I doubt whether the Annual Conferences ought to be kept in the dark touching their dissection or association differently from what they have been, and it may be remembered that so much went out that even our official statement made a different impression. I would rather have the Commission tell how far we have gone along than have erroneous statements about it.

David G. Downey: I think we should remember that we were appointed by important bodies and that our reports must be to those bodies. I think any report going out from us until we make our full report to the General Conference is a courtesy to that body. I recognize the fact that there is something in what has been said about the Annual Conference needing to have information. But, brethren, the Annual Conference will have all that information when the time comes to decide. Now, if this matter were not at some time to go back to the Annual Conferences, there would be much more force in what has been said concerning the necessity of giving the Annual Conference information. But no Annual Conference will be called upon to vote upon this matter before the next General Conference convenes. The first action must be on the part of the General Conferences. The Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will not vote upon this. They cannot. It has not been put in shape to be voted on. It can only come to them as it comes down from the General Conference. Why is it so necessary that they should have these facts when in point of fact we have not reached a definite conclusion upon any point. I would think it well to follow out the suggestion of Brother White, but it is an anomaly in judicial procedure for any one engaged in constitution-making to send out a partial report not to the body that created it, but to an entirely different body.

H. H. White: Did you ever know of a constitutional convention that didn't print a daily journal and let it go out to all the people?

David G. Downey: I am not sure about that. Most of us vote on constitutions from reports coming to us from the men we send to make the constitution, but the special point is that the Annual Conferences will have their opportunity to discuss everything that we finally decide upon and that nothing will be done in the dark. Everything must run the gauntlet of discussion in the General Conferences and then in the Annual Conferences, and it seems to me that the only wise, fitting, and dignified thing for this body to do is to follow the suggestion embodied in the resolution of Brother Du Bose that we appoint ourselves a committee to take this whole matter

into consideration and to make such report to the Church as is necessary. On the main issues our Churches are informed to-day, and there is no reason why every Conference should not discuss the main issue. They are set forth in the declarations of Chattanooga, Oklahoma, and Saratoga. Here are the fundamental principles. If any Annual Conference wants to instruct its delegate or elect its delegate to the General Conference and wants to tell that delegate what to do with reference to those fundamental things, it ought not to attempt to do that thing on the unfinished work of this Commission. It ought to do it on the principles embodied in the Chattanooga, Oklahoma, and Saratoga Joint Commissions. There you have questions that men can reasonably divide upon, and upon those you can give instructions and directions when you send your delegates to the General Conference, and you can tell them what you want them to do on those issues. Let us not send out a garbled, half-baked statement to our people.

H. M. Du Bose: There is a parliamentary question here as to whether or not my paper might not be offered as an amendment to the substitute.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It does not appear to be an amendment. It seems to be a substitute.

H. M. Du Bose: It was meant to be a substitute, but it couldn't be an amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It does not amend or strike out, and therefore it is not an amendment.

Dr. Van Cleve: The situation of this body is not precisely like a general constitutional convention. I would scarcely undertake to say that it is exactly like a diplomatic consultation. It partakes of the characteristics of the two. Referring to that particular instance that Mr. Fairbanks brought up several times, I wondered how it would have seemed if there had been a proposition that the proceedings should not be published on the ground that the Congressional elections were approaching. There is nothing similar between our proceedings and our method of proceeding with problems and those of Congress.

H. H. White: Is not the *Congressional Record* published every day?

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Yes. What would have been the result if on the joint conference between the commissions of Great Britain and this country what was meant to be the debates of the case were published as Congressional reports were?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It is the practice upon the part of wise politicians to give out very few signed statements. Men who are wise in the conduct of public affairs are

rather more liberal with interviews, and I think we would be exceedingly wise if we would follow a somewhat similar procedure, and I would not be willing at all for this incomplete statement of things in which not a single thing has been brought to a finality to go out as the action of this body. I think it would be better to go out this time openly and clearly, as we did not go the last time, with every man at liberty to say what he thinks, because he is going to do it anyhow. We thought we had things tied up. We tied them up just enough to confuse things. If every man is at liberty to make a statement, all right. I remember that last statement that went out was very carefully and artfully devised, and it took me more time to explain it than it took the men to get it up.

Charles W. Kinne: That was intentional.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I guess it was. Every man will explain as he sees proper, and let us be free to do that and take the people in our confidence about what has been done. I think that is a better policy than to give out a statement as suggested.

A. F. Watkins: If the proprieties of the occasion justify me in doing so, I should like to say something about the condition of the Methodist Church, South, in its relation to the negro of the South, but I recognize that they do not. I think it would be well if the occasion would justify it in view of statements made on this floor. I rise, however, to say this, that I am not sure I can vote for the motion as made by Mr. White, and I cannot see my way clear to vote for the amendment or substitute offered by Dr. Thomas; but I should like very much to have an opportunity of voting in favor of the substitute of which we have had notice which was presented or offered to be presented by Dr. Du Bose with reference to the report that should be made to our Annual Conferences.

Mr. H. H. White: I want to say this, that I will agree to the substitute as proposed by Dr. Du Bose provided the majority and minority reports on the negro question are made part of the report.

Voces: No! No!

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I don't think you can interrupt Dr. Watkins with a suggestion of that kind.

A. F. Watkins: With reference to the information needed by our Annual Conferences, I believe it is proper and right that all the Annual Conferences, North and South, should have the information that the General Conferences had at Oklahoma City or Saratoga, and they have expressed themselves freely and fully with reference to the pending proposition. It does not seem to me that the matter should be presented to

the Conferences in their approaching autumn sessions, which are just ahead of us. We haven't completed anything. There is nothing upon which they can fairly or with propriety base any action or recommendation or that they can raise any issue upon which to instruct their representatives, if indeed it is proper for them to so instruct them. There seems to be no necessity for the enlightenment of the Annual Conferences, and all we need is a frank, brief statement such as may be made by two representatives of each Commission as suggested by Dr. Du Bose.

Bishop Leete: I personally seconded the motion of Dr. Thomas because I had complete confidence in the fact that neither one of the Commissions would report in full. I am perfectly willing to agree to Dr. Du Bose's proposition if it is the judgment of the Commission that that should be done. I thought the Southern Commission felt that they didn't want any more reports sent to their people; but if they do want a report and a wise report can be given, I don't object to it, because that is in harmony with what Dr. Thomas wants. I think what he was after was to get something substantial before us to give us opportunity to get through this thing.

F. M. Thomas: That was it.

Bishop Leete: I think Judge White has brought us something that I wish had come a long time ago, but it is too late now. I thought at the beginning the thing to do was to publish everything we did. I would have been perfectly willing to have a daily record going to our people during this meeting. Now, Congress does have a daily record, and constitutional bodies have a daily bulletin publishing what has taken place, and I don't intend in this Commission to say anything that I wouldn't be willing to have printed, North or South, and that would be a great help in the education of our people. I believe we would have been making sentiment if we had been doing that all the time, but we didn't do it.

H. H. White: Dr. Blackwell's resolution at Baltimore was voted down?

Bishop Leete: I know it was. I was not there at the time. Unfortunately, I was called away by the sickness of my daughter.

F. M. Thomas: I will accept Dr. Du Bose's motion.

T. N. Ivey: I want to inquire if a motion to amend the substitute offered by Dr. Du Bose is not in order.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It is now, because it is accepted by Brother Thomas.

T. N. Ivey: I would ask that that substitute be read.

The Secretary (Dr. Thomas): The Thomas amendment is:

"Resolved that the Secretary be instructed to print the minutes in condensed form."

Edgar Blake: Does that include the report?

F. M. Thomas: It includes what has been acted upon.

Edgar Blake: Is that for publication?

F. M. Thomas: No, sir.

Edgar Blake: Are those to be printed?

F. M. Thomas: That will be determined later.

T. N. Ivey: I move to amend the Du Bose substitute by striking out the words relating to the agreement being "contingent upon the action taken upon the negro question." [This motion was seconded by several.] I do not think it will be wise to put that in in that shape.

Edgar Blake: Personally I want to support the amendment of Dr. Ivey. My understanding is that the actions which we have taken—

F. M. Thomas: I will accept that.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Proceed, Dr. Blake.

Edgar Blake: My understanding is that the actions we have taken here already are necessarily contingent upon a consideration and action on the other reports. We have only given consideration to a single report, and that is not complete, and there are three committee reports yet to come, and for that reason I do not believe in sending out the report and signing it or naming it as the report upon which that which we have done is contingent. I would like to call attention to a certain thing on which we have made substantial progress and which I think ought to be given to our people. We have reached a tentative agreement on the matter of the Church Conferences, on the matter of the Quarterly Conferences, on the matter of the District Conferences. We have reached a tentative agreement on the subject of the Annual Conferences, including lay representation in the Annual Conference. We have reached an agreement touching the matter of Regional Conferences, their membership and their powers. We have reached an agreement on the basis of representation in the General Conference. We have reached a tentative agreement on the election of bishops, their confirmation and their consecration or ordination. We have reached an agreement on the matter of assignment of bishops and on the matter of their retirement. We have reached an agreement on the matter of their privileges and their powers and their duties, and it seems to me that that makes a pretty substantial record for one meeting; and I believe that, while it is unnecessary that we should give the Church full details that are related to these actions that have been taken by us, we should announce to the Church that we have made progress and that we have reached tentative agreements on these propositions, but that

the agreements are merely tentative and are contingent upon actions upon reports yet to come. It seems to me that that makes a fair report.

David G. Downey: Would you be willing to name the two reports, not merely the one, but the two?

Edgar Blake: What I would do is this: I would say that the report of the Committee on Conferences has not been completed yet, but as far as it has gone these items were agreed upon; that we had before us a committee report on the Judicial Council that has not been considered as yet; another report on the status of the negro that has not been considered as yet by the Joint Conference. I would also say that we have a fourth Committee on General Reference that has not been considered as yet. So I am in favor of Dr. Ivey's motion. I do not think we know at this time that it is contingent upon the matter in Dr. Du Bose's paper. I think it would be very unwise for us to say that. There are many other things that it will be contingent upon, and I do not think it would be wise to send out any such statement as that.

David G. Downey: I am speaking in opposition to the motion of Dr. Ivey. I think you will recall the statement made by Bishop McDowell just before he left, that it was to be clearly understood that every agreement made was tentative and was conditional upon our reaching an agreement on other vital matters, specifying among others the status of the colored man in the reorganized Church. My own conviction is that on these matters we should speak out with the utmost brotherliness and the utmost frankness. We all know perfectly well where the main difficulty lies. Nothing is gained by trying to cover it up. I would have no objection at all to stating, as I think Dr. Blake largely implied—that is, that these agreements were tentative—that we had not yet considered the report on Judicial Council nor the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church and that all these tentative matters that had been agreed upon were conditioned upon our reaching an agreement on those other matters.

T. N. Ivey: That is not what he said.

David G. Downey: He came pretty near saying that. He said that we should state that we have reached certain tentative agreements, but that there were other reports to come—namely, the report of the Committee on Judicial Council and the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church—and that these tentative agreements are dependent for acceptance upon our reaching an agreement on this other report.

T. N. Ivey: Did he mention the General Reference Committee?

David G. Downey: Yes, but it has not been before us yet. I think it is infinitely preferable for us to accept the substitute offered by Dr. Du Bose rather than that of Dr. Ivey and that we should pass the amendment made by the substitute of Dr. Thomas with the amendment of Dr. Du Bose. We can trust, then, the gentlemen of the committee, the four, to bring us in the right sort of declaration. I think the only straight and fair way to go before our people is without the slightest indirection. We owe something to these members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

W. N. Ainsworth: I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded.

Irving G. Penn: I hope that motion will not be insisted upon. I want to say a word or two.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Will Dr. Ainsworth withdraw the motion?

W. N. Ainsworth: If Brother Penn wishes to speak, I will withdraw the motion. I am always glad to hear Brother Penn on any subject, but I do think this subject is exhausted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion for the previous question is withdrawn.

Irving G. Penn: When I came up to this convention so much had been done in the way of publication concerning the status of the negro in the reorganized Church that I felt that it would be one of the things which would be frankly and candidly discussed and disposed of. Dr. Jones and I wanted to be in a position to go back to our people and, when they asked us questions concerning the matter, be in a position to say that the matter was frankly and candidly discussed and that there was a postponement of it, if there was a postponement, in connection with other matters and that they would be published in connection with any other publication that might be sent out about other matters that were tentatively settled. In the first place, I agree thoroughly with Dr. Goucher that there has already been too much talk in the Church papers on this matter, and I did not want to go into the Church papers myself, but I had to because of the situation with reference to our people; and if I now go into the Church papers about this it will be because of the situation of our people that necessitates such a thing, because you brethren must understand that, while we are hung up in this discussion, there are three distinct negro bodies of Methodists operating right before our eyes, and in some cases they take advantage of our being hung up and are making it very uncomfortable for our people, and I think the wisest thing

for you and us would be to publish some such statement of progress made—that we are trying to get through with these things and trying to arrive at a conclusion. I agree with those who have made the statement that we should not report or make any attempt to report to the people on the outside. We are ambassadors who have been appointed by the General Conference, and we ought not to be publishing our reports before we report to the body that created us. We should carefully word the statement and simply say that we are making progress as a Commission, and if we want to give a little information here and there concerning it all right, but if we publish that we have agreed on some things tentatively, and then let the other thing that we all know is the crux of the situation be still hung up, we will be in a difficult position. There is going to be the same difficulty in January as there is to-day. There will be the same difficulty in April as to-day, and if you want time to think about these things, I think we can educate our people and think that our people may yield something, and if you think you can educate some of your people in the Southern Church till they will be more liberal there may be hope for us all. If you think you can educate the Methodist Church so that they will do differently from what they do now, let us simply say that we have made progress and not put out a statement that makes them believe we have agreed tentatively on some things, but which lets everybody know that the negro question is still up in the air. I am tired of the situation. I am a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church and have never been a member of any other Church, but I am a little bit tired about being hung up in the air. My status is established, and the status of 350,000 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been established, and when I come to think of it we don't need any committee on the status of the negro.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think the Church is entitled to hear after the sittings of this Commission of the things that we have done and of the things that led us to our conclusions, tentative and otherwise. They are as profoundly interested as we are, and it is our duty to give the Church in some official way a brief résumé of what we have done and the conclusions, tentative or otherwise, that we have reached. The point at which the Commission will be worthy of blame in the estimation of the Church, and I apprehend that some are thinking about possible censure, will be not that we do not make a report to the Church, but that we haven't anything substantial to report; and, my brothers, I think we are blame-worthy at this point. It is a mistake for us to have this Commission in existence for the time it has been and meet from

time to time and work as we have worked and not come to a fair and open statement of what we all recognize to be the crux of this situation, the one issue that makes every other conclusion we arrive at to be a tentative conclusion; and for one I am very much of the conviction that I ought as far as in me lies to stay at the appointed place of meeting until we have faced the three crucial issues before us or else resign my place on the Commission and let somebody else attend to it who can do it. The point at which we may be censured by the Church is that we meet from time to time and consider all the incidental matters, incidental at least so far as the main crucial question is concerned, and yet do not face that fairly at any time that we come together. I think we ought to meet all day to-morrow and give ourselves to the consideration of the negro in the reorganized Church.

J. H. Reynolds: I move the previous question.

The motion being seconded and a vote being had, the main question was ordered.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Ivey was agreed to. A further vote being taken, the report as amended by the adoption of Dr. Ivey's amendment was agreed to.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The question now is on the other clause: "Moved that the Secretary be instructed to print the minutes in condensed form."

A vote being taken, this motion was carried.

Robert E. Jones: We have been thinking all the time that we were coming upon the question that we were most interested in, and we have been left in this plight. We voted with the minority against the majority report, but we do not support the minority report. Both Dr. Penn and myself would like to have the courtesy of reading into the record as a matter of history just a brief statement that I think will not involve anybody.

F. M. Thomas: May I ask Brother Jones a question? Are you going upon the hypothesis that we expect to adjourn to-night?

Robert E. Jones: Yes, it looks that way.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Do you ask that as a matter of privilege?

Robert E. Jones: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Read it.

Robert E. Jones (reading): "The undersigned members on the Subcommittee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church find themselves unable to accept either the majority or the minority report. Neither of these reports regards the rights of our colored membership as protected by the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We

submit that the Chattanooga agreement suggesting a Regional Conference for the colored membership with representation in the General Conference is the only fair and equitable solution of the question so far suggested." This is signed by myself and Dr. Penn.

John F. Goucher: It is now half past ten o'clock, and I move that we adjourn to meet to-morrow morning at the usual time.

H. M. Du Bose: Will you withhold that motion until I make one?

John F. Goucher: Very well.

H. M. Du Bose: I now move that the committee called for in this motion be appointed to-night and instructed to report to the Commission to-morrow morning. We want to hear that report before it goes out.

The motion of Dr. Du Bose was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Our committees are usually chosen by representatives of the two Commissions.

Henry Wade Rogers: May I ask to be excused after the adjournment to-night?

The request was granted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion is that the committee be appointed, two from each side.

David G. Downey: A question of privilege. You see the small body that is now present, and Judge Rogers is going away, and it may be that there are others who contemplate going away, and I don't think we should proceed with such a small body.

E. B. Chappell: I don't think any others are going away.

David G. Downey: May we find out? Can we not ask and ascertain?

F. M. Thomas: I know what Dr. Downey has in mind, and I will say in all kindness and with perfect frankness that never since I have been a member of the Commission have I seen it abuse its own privileges as it has this afternoon and to-night. In our own Commission I voted to take up this question that some of you brethren seem to want to discuss. If we had adhered to our program that we had outlined without being deflected, we could have disposed of the Judicial Council report, and we could discuss the negro question to-morrow morning.

David G. Downey: I am not proposing an adjournment. I have stated before and I state now that I am ready to remain, but we have a greatly depleted Commission. The question is, Is it right and fit and proper for us to go on? If so, I am here to the finish.

Edgar Blake: Owing to developments that have taken place within the Commission, I want to ask to be excused from attending further sessions after the session to-morrow morning.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That will be granted.

Bishop Leete: May we find out how many we have left? Figuring up hastily, I see that we have on our side just about three-fifths now. In fact, we have just about three-fifths on each side. If there are any more resignations or leaves of absence, I don't know but that I might as well go now. I hope we can preserve a sufficient quorum to transact business, and I hope at the next meeting there will be some kind of an indication as to how long a time we are expected to stay, so that we can all make our arrangements to stay the full time.

Secretary Harris: The next meeting ought to be two weeks. It is not fair to ask men with such responsible matters as these men have to ask them to come without giving them notice as to how long they are expected to stay.

W. N. Ainsworth: I move that every man who can and will stay to-morrow morning hold up his hand.

John M. Moore: I do not want to stay unless we are going to do something.

Secretary Harris: We can do something if we undertake to do something and not talk about going home, and if we are not going to do business I would like to take the morning train at five o'clock. It means a saving of twenty-four hours, but I want to work, and I want to know what we are going to do.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): I think discussions are out of order. We were called upon to announce the committee.

Bishop Cranston: Before we make our selections, I would like to know how many of our side are going to stay until to-morrow evening.

Charles W. Kinne: I stand just where Dr. Moore stands. It means twenty-four hours to me to leave in the morning, and I don't want to stay unless there is going to be something done.

Bishop Cooke: Eleven of our men will have gone by to-morrow morning.

Edgar Blake: I withdraw my request to be excused to-morrow at noon provided the Commission will get down to business and discuss the important issue and not discuss the minor matters of procedure. We have wasted the entire evening in discussing adjournment and place of meeting when we ought to have spent the entire time on the report of

the Committee on Conferences, which I think we could have completed. It is useless to fuss around as we have been during the meeting of this Commission, and I hope when we meet again the next time we will not have any separate sessions, and I say that for two reasons. In the first place, I get discouraged when I meet with our own brethren. The next place, whenever we meet to discuss these matters by ourselves, not knowing the viewpoint of the other side, we get farther apart, we act like—O, well, excuse me.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You don't.

Edgar Blake: I don't, and I am not going to. I am willing to stay here all day to-morrow and all the remainder of the week if the Commission will buckle down and discuss the reports and do some business; but if we are going to discuss this outside matter, I am for going home at five o'clock in the morning with Dr. Moore.

Bishop Candler: I appoint on that committee Dr. Du Bose and Dr. Lamar.

Bishop Cranston: I appoint Dr. Blake and Dr. Harris.

W. N. Ainsworth: I move that we adjourn until to-morrow at nine o'clock.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Before we adjourn I move that Dr. Stuart be allowed to sit in the place of A. J. Nast, who has asked leave of absence.

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Thereupon the Commission was dismissed with the benediction by Rev. Dr. Stuart.

SEVENTH DAY, JULY 3, 1917.

The Joint Commission met at 9 A.M. and was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Candler.

Hymn No. 364 was sung, and the Commission was led in prayer by A. F. Watkins, as follows: We thank thee, our Heavenly Father, that thou hast guided us all along the pathway of life. We thank thee that thou hast come to meet with us, and we believe that thou hast been with us from the very first day and that from day to day thy fatherly hand has held thy Church secure. We thank thee that we have been able to recognize thy presence and to see thee in the things that come into our lives and to know that all things work together for good to them that love thee, and we thank thee that we have been taught of thee and to love thee, and with humility we may claim the fulfillment of thy promise in our lives, for

we know that we love thee, and we pray that we may love thee more. We pray that there may be in us always a sense of thy presence and thy guidance. We know that there is not an experience that comes to thy children that thou dost not enter into. We pray thee that we may recognize this day that thou, Lord, art with us and that we are doing the things that thou wouldest have us do. We pray that the mind of Christ Jesus may be with us. We pray thee that thou wilt bless these thy servants gathered here. Bless us in our relations to each other. May we feel the love of God in our hearts, and may the Holy Spirit come to us, and may we realize each day that we are walking under thy guidance and that we are the children of thy loving favor! We ask thy blessing upon the great purposes that bring us to this place. Grant that we may be able to divest ourselves by the grace of Jesus Christ of every unholy feeling, every unworthy thought, and every unsubmissive thought, and grant that we may do only those things that are blessed in thy sight. We thank thee for the record of the Church of God and the promise that thou hast given us that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. We thank thee that thou vouchsafest to call us to the fellowship as sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. We thank thee for this branch of the Christian Church, for the privilege of being disciples of Jesus Christ. We pray that we may live worthily in thy sight and that we may properly do the work that thou hast committed to us. We pray that the blessings of the Lord may rest upon the Church of God, that we may be honest in spirit, that with all generosity and liberality of spirit we may work together in the service of God and for the redemption of thy kingdom. We ask that thy blessing may abide with these thy servants as they deliberate for the cause of the Church of Christ. Grant that we may be inspired by thy Spirit that we may be quick to see the indications of the will of God. Grant that not our will but thy will shall underlie all that we attempt to do. O God, bless thy people everywhere. Bless our country. We pray that the benedictions of our Father may rest upon the President of the United States and those who are associated with him in the assumption and carrying on of the responsibilities of this critical time. Lord, bless our people and grant, our Father, that in the great purpose that actuates them they may be met by thee and that they may feel that they are doing the work of God as servants of God and servants of the nation, and now we commit ourselves to thy keeping. May we, our Father, realize to-day thy love in our hearts and thy presence. O God, guide and protect us and keep us and finally save us in heaven for Jesus' sake. Amen.

A lesson from the fifteenth chapter of John was read.

Hymn 317, "More love to thee," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): Dr. Joy will lead us in prayer.

James R. Joy: O God, our Heavenly Father, we are met here to lift our hearts to thee at the beginning of this last day of our deliberations. We pray that thou wilt come and take complete control of us. Thou art our Heavenly Father. We know that all wisdom is from thee, and we know that all we have of love is learned from thee. We have learned that thou art a God of power. May we have a dispensation from thy store of wisdom this day as we continue with this work, a work which we believe is thy work! May we have from thy store of love a dispensation of unselfishness as we go forward with this work, which we believe must be inspired by wisdom and by love, and may we draw upon thy store of powers as we shall apply our human power to the solution of these problems! Thou hast brought us here to this great and beautiful country. Beneath thy guiding hand our fathers crossed the sea, under thy guidance have built up this commonwealth. We believe, our Heavenly Father, that thou hast guided us through the generations down to this present time and that we are what we are because in some measure we have accepted the guidance of thy Holy Spirit, and now, our Heavenly Father, as we have come to the point that seems to mark a new milestone in our progress we pray thee for that light which our fathers had, for that wisdom and love and power which thou givest to thy children, that we may apply ourselves to this work and that we may go forward to accomplish thy will unitedly for the better service of thee and for the better service of our country, and we ask it in the name of thy dear Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): We will now have the roll call.

The roll call resulted as follows: From the Methodist Episcopal Church, South: Bishops Candler, Murrah. Ministers: Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. T. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White. From the Methodist Episcopal Church: Bishops Earl Cranston, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, C. M. Stuart (vice Nast), E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Van Cleve, John J. Wallace. Laymen: A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, J. R. Joy, William Rule.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

Bishop Leete: A matter of personal privilege. I rise to ask that we have the address to the Churches ready and that some of us who feel that we ought may be permitted to leave at 10:25. I would be willing to stay if there was anything very essential; but if I stay after that I will have to change my whole plan of return, and instead of going North, as I intended, I shall have to go South. I can save a whole day if I can get away on this train. Personally I am willing to trust the members on these tentative matters. One reason for trusting them especially is that they are all tentative. While I am on my feet, in order that I may not have to speak again, I would like to express my personal hope, though I am not averse to any other place, that we might go to Savannah for the next meeting. This is a historic place. It is not only the place that is linked with the history of our Church, but it is a place that we can get into and out of without the embarrassment that we are suffering here. This is delightful while you are here, but it is difficult to get in or get out.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): If there is no objection, Bishop Leete will be permitted to withdraw when the time mentioned arrives.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I rise to a matter of personal privilege on behalf of Dr. C. B. Spencer. He was compelled to go away, because if he missed this morning's train at 8:35 he would not be able to get home until Saturday. He asked me to present his excuse that he be excused from further attendance.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): If there is no objection, he will be excused. Some of us have a very ardent hope that we may be able to go over the report of the Committee on Judicial Council. In view of the fact that we have completed the construction of the General Conferences as far as we can go now and the Regional Conferences and the essential points of that report, it would seem that our work would appear to the Church to have been better done if we can come to an agreement also on the Judicial Council, and, therefore, I hope that we can take up the report of the Committee on Judicial Council.

C. M. Bishop: Have we gone over the work of the Committee on Conferences?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No.

Edgar Blake: I can finish that report in a very short time, but we should first take up the report of the committee which is to draft the report for the Churches. That should be done out of courtesy to some of the members who are going at an early hour this morning.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We will do that.

Dr. Blake read the report, as follows:

The members of the Joint Commission on Unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in closing the labors of the second session, held at Traverse City, Mich., June 27 to July 3, 1917, send greetings to the people of the two branches of the one Church which they represent.

First of all, we give thanks to God, the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, for the full measure of grace which he has vouchsafed us in our labors and for the evident tokens of the presence of the Holy Spirit in our assemblies, sweetening our fellowship, deepening our sense of oneness in Christ, and strengthening our hope of a united Methodism throughout the reaches of our common country.

We do not seek in this message to diminish the general understanding of the difficulties which have attended our efforts to meet fully the task committed to our hands; but we have rejoiced greatly in Christ, our divine Leader, to see how many of these difficulties have dissolved away as we have approached them in a spirit of prayer and dedication to the end which the Church has set us to achieve. The results of our labors are not yet complete, but they are substantial and reassuring, and it is part of the purpose of this communication to inform the connections which we represent of the fact that we have the unfinished details of our task under prayerful consideration and treatment, and it is our earnest desire to be able to make to our respective General Conferences a happy report upon the whole matter of unification.

That our people may have the means of determining for themselves the extent to which we have progressed, we beg to submit the following statement touching the conclusions reached at this sitting of the Commission:

The Joint Commission has reached tentative agreements upon the following matters:

1. The Church Conference.
2. The Quarterly Conference.
3. The Annual Conference, including lay representation therein.
4. The composition and powers of the white Regional Conferences.
5. The area, boundaries, and powers of the Missionary Regional Conferences.
6. The basis of representation in the General Conference and the powers of the same.
7. The method of election, assignment, and retirement of bishops, together with a constitutional provision for the defining and fixing the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy.

The foregoing tentative agreements are subject to further consideration and revision, if necessary, and their final approval and adoption is contingent upon agreement on the matters that are yet to be considered.

Bishop Lcete: I move that the report be adopted as a whole.

Bishop Cooke: I second the motion.

John F. Goucher: I heartily agree, if the committee will allow a little editing.

Edgar Blake: If we want to complete the report of the Committee on Conferences, we shall have to do that. [A vote being taken, the report was adopted.] Now I move that we take up the report of the Committee on Conferences.

Bishop Leete: While we are waiting for that may I say as far as I personally am concerned I have greatly enjoyed the sessions of the Conference and the fellowship of the brethren and the fair and fine spirit that has been evidenced, it seems to me, all around, and I propose to hope and to pray for that happy end which we are beginning to anticipate with more faith than we have ever had before.

Edgar Blake: May I call the attention of the Commission to what is before us in the report of the Committee on Conferences. We have completed, I think, our consideration for this session of all the items that have to do with the white Regional Conferences. One of those items has been recommitted to the committee. We now have to consider that article dealing with the organization of the Missionary Regional Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Did we finish the Annual Conferences?

Edgar Blake: Yes, and we have to deal with the section dealing with the powers of the General Conference and such minor sections as refer to date of meetings. If you will turn to Article VII.—

E. B. Chappell: It seems to me that we should complete the matter we had up yesterday, the powers of the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: I hope we won't waste time on procedure, but that we shall get to business at once.

E. B. Chappell: We don't seem to have gotten through anything.

Edgar Blake: This Article VII. is now before us on Missionary Conferences.

SECTION 1. There shall be the following Missionary Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Missionary Regional Conference:

(1) Eastern Asia, including China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia.

(2) Southern Asia, including India and Burma.

(3) Europe, including Africa.

(4) Latin America, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

Area and Boundaries

SECTION 2. The area and boundaries of Missionary Regional Jurisdictions may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting.

Privileges and Powers

SECTION 3. The privileges and powers of each of the Missionary Regional Conferences and the conditions of membership therein shall be determined by the General Conference.

Now let me offer a word of explanation concerning this section. We have here provided for the organization of our for-

eign territory into Missionary Regional Jurisdictions, and we suggest the following divisions: We have followed and generally recognize the divisions now current among those who are interested in this foreign work, Eastern Asia, Southern Asia, Europe, including Africa and Latin America. Then we have provided that the areas and boundaries of these Missionary Regional Jurisdictions can be changed at any time by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting. Instead of attempting to define the powers of the Regional Missionary Conferences in the constitution, we felt it wiser to leave that to the General Conference, due to the fact that those are developing areas and their privileges and powers will change from time to time. Now, I move that we tentatively approve the opening statement of Section 1, that there shall be the following Missionary Regional Conferences, each having its own Missionary Regional Conference so the following Missionary Regional Jurisdictions each have its own Missionary Conference. [The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.] Now, I move that we approve the division as set forth in 1, 2, 3, and 4, subject to further consideration, revision, and recommendation by the committee. That virtually recommits the matter to the committee.

John F. Goucher: I would like to see the first one amended by adding "Hawaii." There is only one English-speaking congregation in the island. Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos are all carrying on work there to a considerable extent, and it is necessary that they should be identified with the Eastern Asia Regional Conference and have exchange ministers, and it will add very much more to the convenience of the administration.

Edgar Blake: Hawaii is now administered from the Pacific Coast and administered far more successfully than it could be from China. There would be just as much reason to attach our Western Coast to China. We simply refer this to the committee for further consideration, and if the committee afterwards finds it wise to do this it can be done; but until we have more sufficient reasons than indicated I don't think we should add Hawaii.

John F. Goucher: There is no difficulty in showing a reason, but time is so important that I don't care to go into it.

John M. Moore: I move that we add Japan. A larger part of the Church is in an independent mission there.

Edgar Blake: The committee considered including Japan in this, and we all hoped that Japan would come in if we adopted this method of reorganization; but in view of the fact that Japan is an independent Church, that there would be a

476 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

little difficulty in defining the matter so as to make it perfectly clear that the only thing you had in mind was that limited work you have there, I think it would be better not to include Japan at this time. I think it would likely give offense to Japan.

John M. Moore: I withdraw my motion.

A vote being taken, the motion to approve the section was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now, Section 2 reads:

The area and boundaries of Missionary Regional Jurisdiction may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting.

I move that we approve that section.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Section 3 reads:

The privileges and powers of each of the Missionary Regional Conferences and the conditions of membership therein shall be determined by the General Conference.

Now, may I, in answer to Mr. Van Cleve's question, give the reason for inserting the word "each" so as to make it possible for the General Conference in considering the conditions of general membership and power to deal with each on its own merits? It is not probable that we can deal with them all at the same time. Now, I move the tentative approval of this section.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now, I move the tentative approval of the whole Article VII.

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now turn to the powers of the General Conference. It is on page 8 of my copy and begins:

SECTION 2. Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, the General Conference shall have full legislative power over all matters distinctly correctional; and in the exercise of said powers shall have authority as follows:

I move the tentative approval of that introductory statement.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now we come to the various powers:

(1) To define and fix the conditions, privileges, and duties of Church membership.

I move the tentative approval of that.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 477

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake:

(2) To define and fix the qualifications and duties of elders, deacons, local preachers, exhorters, and deaconesses.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake:

(3) To define and fix the powers and duties of District, Quarterly, and Church Conferences.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake:

(4) To define and fix the powers and duties of Regional Missionary Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign the bishops to the same.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

C. M. Bishop: I want to inquire whether at any place we have determined the minimum number for an Annual Conference.

Edgar Blake: We do—14,000. Now the fifth clause:

To define and fix the powers and duties of Regional Missionary Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign bishops to the same.

I move the tentative approval of that.

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake:

(6) To divide, consolidate, and change the Regional Conferences; but it shall not take away territory from any Regional Conference without its consent, save by the concurrent vote of two successive General Conferences; nor shall it create any new Regional Conference with less than five hundred thousand members in full connection.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Without stopping to think, we have made it in the power of the General Conference to elect a bishop for the Regional Conferences.

H. M. Du Bose: Missionary Regional Conferences.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I beg your pardon.

John M. Moore: Does that mean that the General Conferences elect the missionary bishops?

Edgar Blake: No, that they may elect the bishop for the Missionary Regional Conferences.

John M. Moore: To be assigned to the Missionary Regional Conferences?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

John M. Moore: That will require some attention, electing them by the Regional Conferences and having them confirmed by the General Conference. This brings up the matter of electing the bishops for the Regional Conference work, and we should give a little more study to it.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to this, that we have provided that the white Regional Conferences—that is the only thing we have to deal with—shall elect their own bishops, subject to the confirmation of the General Conference, and those bishops shall be automatically assigned to the region that elected them, but we shall have to have bishops for service in the Missionary Regional Jurisdictions. It was felt by the committee that we could not refer the election of missionaries to the Regional Conference delegation. In the first place, there are too few, and then we felt that we could not permit the election of a bishop to those Regional Conferences; that we should provide ourselves for the election in those where there is a large number. It was felt that it was better in the present stage that the General Conference should elect the bishop for the same. In other words, all that the General Conference does is simply this: for the time being in the election of a bishop for this particular jurisdiction it takes the place of the jurisdictions themselves. But the bishops elected are as much the general superintendents as bishops elected by the Regional Conference.

John M. Moore: I would prefer that those bishops who are elected for work with the Missionary Regional Conferences should be elected by those who had been elected under the Regional Conferences. That is my personal preference in the matter. I would prefer that the General Conference did not have the initiative in electing bishops general superintendents for the missionary field. I think that would be better, but this does not specify, and we may have to work this out.

Edgar Blake: So long as this is tentative, subject to future revision, I think it would be safe to pass this. It does not prevent future consideration.

A vote being taken, the motion to approve tentatively the sixth clause was carried.

Edgar Blake: The seventh clause has already been tentatively approved.

Bishop Candler: I think we should wipe out all that retiring thing and make it just the same as the other. And if it is in order, I move that the rules for retiring them be the same rules as heretofore adopted.

Edgar Blake: I don't quite catch the question.

Bishop Candler: I should have spoken on five.

Edgar Blake: The bishops of the Regional Conferences come under the same rule as the bishops already.

Bishop Candler: All right, then.

Edgar Blake:

(8) To alter and change the hymnal and the ritual of the Church and to regulate all matters relating to the form and mode of worship.

I move the tentative adoption.

The motion was seconded.

A. F. Watkins: Ought we not to add, "Except that the General Conference shall not have power to change the doctrine set forth in the ritual"?

Edgar Blake: We have already provided in a restrictive rule that the General Conference shall not do that.

David G. Downey: What is the difference between altering and changing?

Edgar Blake: I do not know that I can give the exact distinction. The most exact mind on the committee, Brother Simpson, framed that.

H. M. Du Bose: That is the common, ordinary language.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): How would it do to insert "provide" instead of "alter"?

John F. Goucher: The change might be to eliminate, or it might add to, and alter would be to change the whole thing.

Edgar Blake: I move the tentative approval of this clause.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The ninth reads as follows:

To prescribe the method of acquisition, control, and disposition of the real and personal property of the Church and of all its branches.

I move the tentative approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The tenth reads:

To govern the judicial administration of the Church except as herein otherwise provided.

I move the tentative approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The eleventh clause reads:

To consider and, if deemed wise, to disapprove of the decision of the Judicial Council upon any constitutional question and to require its submission to the members of the Annual Conferences, the decision of a majority of whom, present and voting, shall be final thereon.

I move the tentative approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: This says to disapprove of the decision of the Judicial Council upon any constitutional question. Suppose the Judicial Council decided something and the General Conference thought different.

Edgar Blake: It would be submitted to the Annual Conferences, the decision of a majority of whom would be binding.

John M. Moore: If the Judicial Council says it is not a constitutional question, the General Conference can say it is, and *vice versa*.

Edgar Blake: Just the opposite to that.

John M. Moore: If the Judicial Council says the question is a constitutional question, then it must go to the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: If the General Conference should pass an act and the constitutionality of that act should be questioned and appealed to the Judicial Council and the Judicial Council should decide that the General Conference had exceeded its authority under the constitution in that matter and therefore that it was not constitutional, it would be possible for the General Conference to disapprove of or disagree with the statements of the Judicial Council and to ask that the matter be referred to the Annual Conferences for their decision, which decision would be binding.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): In other words, the General Conference would appeal to the Annual Conferences?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

W. N. Ainsworth: Would that have the effect of bringing about a protest in the Church whereby the decision of the Judicial Council would be overturned by a majority vote of the Church?

Edgar Blake: No, we will come to that directly. We provide that in changing the constitution. This article that we have agreed upon requires a two-thirds vote in the Annual Conference and the same in the General Conference, but on the question as to whether an act is constitutional or unconstitutional, then that requires simply a majority vote.

Bishop Cooke: It is very clear in connection with the section referring to the Judicial Council, which I think has been accepted by both of us, which reads as follows: "In all cases a decision of the Judicial Council shall be final, provided that if on a constitutional question there shall be a majority of the General Conference, present and voting, disapproving of the decision of the Judicial Council the question shall then be

sent to the Annual Conferences for final decision as provided in Paragraph so-and-so or Section so-and-so."

Henry Wade Rogers: As provided for in the constitution, but that will have to be adopted.

Edgar Blake: We will make the report of the Judicial Council conform to this.

Henry Wade Rogers: I think it should conform to this and not this to that. If the Judicial Council holds an act unconstitutional, it ought to be sent down and submitted to the regular process of modifying or amending the constitution, so that the vote which sets aside the Judicial Council ought to be the same vote which is required for amending the constitution.

Edgar Blake: I think there is a difference, although it may not appear so to other minds. We are now making the fundamental law of the Church. This is a constitution, and what we do can be changed only by a two-thirds vote. But if we give this Judicial Council of fourteen or fifteen men the power by a decision to write something into the constitution or take something out of the constitution, I question whether we ought to do that. The question comes here as to whether an act which conforms to the fundamental law is a question on which the Church has a right to appeal from the decision of those fourteen or fifteen men.

Henry Wade Rogers: You cannot submit to the people who do not know anything about law whether a decision of a court is right or wrong. But you can overcome that decision by passing a constitutional amendment which assumes that the decision of the court is correct, but if the people want to change it they can change it by a two-thirds vote.

Edgar Blake: I move that that be recommitted to the committee for a further investigation.

Bishop Candler: I would like to ask a question for information. I have not seen in anything before us who decides questions of law in the Regional Conference, the bishop presiding or his Conference.

Edgar Blake: The General Conference has the power to define and fix the duties of the bishop, and I suppose they will provide whether a bishop will do that.

Bishop Candler: It is not in this document.

Edgar Blake: No.

Bishop Candler: It should be, and I will show you the reason. The General Conference has no power to bring a Conference before it, Regional or Annual, and in preserving uniformity it may have to hold somebody responsible. They can bring a bishop, but they can't bring an Annual or a Regional Conference. There should be some provision somewhere that

the General Conference can hold somebody responsible for uniformity.

Edgar Blake: I move that the suggestion offered by Bishop Candler be referred to the committee for consideration.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The twelfth clause reads as follows:

To control and direct all connectional, publishing, missionary, benevolent, and educational enterprises of the Church.

I move its tentative approval.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The thirteenth clause reads:

To govern any and all other matters of a connectional character.

I move the tentative approval of this.

The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

Edgar Blake: Now we come to the restrictions.

W. N. Ainsworth: May I ask before we go into that if these restrictive rules conform to what we have in the district?

Edgar Blake: Yes. The restrictive rules have never been changed.

David G. Downey: I would like to ask Bishop Candler if in the Discipline of his Church there is not a provision for a change which is not as strict as ours. I think there is a provision in your Church in regard to an amendment which comes in there, and I think there is nothing in your Discipline that absolutely and irrevocably forbids an amendment of the Articles of Religion or of the standards.

F. M. Thomas: Here is what you probably refer to:

The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our Articles of Religion or establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

David G. Downey: That is the point.

Edgar Blake: Let me read from our Discipline: "Section 46, Subsection 1: The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our Articles of Religion nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine."

David G. Downey: That is all right. When we come to the matter of amending, I shall stand for the provision of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Edgar Blake: I move the tentative approval of this first section of the restrictions, which reads as follows:

The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, nor change our Articles of Religion nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now the second restriction:

The General Conference shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away with episcopacy nor do away with an itinerant general superintendency.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Ought not that to read "the itinerant general superintendency" instead of "an itinerant general superintendency"?

Bishop Cooke: I do not agree to that. Our general superintendency, our kind—is not involved.

E. B. Chappell: That is what "the" means.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The word "the" makes it ample.

Bishop Cooke: I do not see that we lose anything by retaining the word "plan," because there is a plan of our itinerant general superintendency, whether we leave the words in or out. There is a plan, and it would then read as it already has read: "Shall not do away with nor destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency." Of course that would fix this plan. I see the difficulty there.

Edgar Blake: The reason for dropping out the word "plan" is as follows. Suppose it read: "The General Conference shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away with episcopacy nor do away with the plan of itinerant general superintendency." Some member would say immediately: "What plan?" It means the plan in vogue in 1908. We thought we would put it so that no member could rise up to plague us.

John F. Goucher: I move that we strike out those four words so that it will read:

The General Conference shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away with the episcopacy or with itinerant general superintendency.

Edgar Blake: That doesn't affect it. What we have makes it perfectly clear.

John F. Goucher: I think it is more specific the way I put it. You can have all sorts of itinerant general superintendencies. I move to strike out the words: "Do away with an."

C. M. Bishop: Then the "nor" should be changed to "or."

Edgar Blake: You had better leave it as it is rather than to change it. This can be revised on further consideration, but there is danger.

484 Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : I recognize Brother Van Cleve.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I offer the following amendment: Add "But may elect a bishop for any of our foreign missions."

Edgar Blake: We want only one class of bishops, and I do not believe that any man should be elected to the episcopacy who is not big enough to be a bishop anywhere.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You have to put in the word "destroy" if you take that out.

John F. Goucher: I withdraw my amendment.

A vote being taken, the section was approved.

Secretary Harris: A trifling change to insert "to" between "nor" and "had." It related to the doing away.

Edgar Blake: All we do here will have to be treated editorially, and matters of that kind can be covered by the editorial commission.

Secretary Harris: This is not merely a matter of language. It goes farther than that.

E. B. Chappell: The way it is here it is an independent sentence not dependent on previous sentences.

Secretary Harris: That is just the question that I am raising. It means that the General Conference shall not change or do away with, and the other clause is "not change or alter any part of the rules so as to do away." There is a slight difference that may be important.

The chairman (Bishop Cranston): Do you make that motion, Dr. Harris?

Secretary Harris: Yes, to test it.

Edgar Blake: It is not quite clear to me. Perhaps I may be a little overworked.

Secretary Harris: Then I move to defer.

Voces: No.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Harris was agreed to.

A further vote being taken, the section as amended was adopted.

Edgar Blake: The third paragraph reads as follows:

The General Conference shall not revoke nor change the general rules of our Church.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

Edgar Blake: The fourth paragraph reads as follows:

The General Conference shall not deprive our ministers of the right of trial by the Annual Conference, or by a select number thereof, nor of an appeal; nor shall it deprive our members of the right of trial by a committee of members of our Church, nor of an appeal.

I move the tentative approval of that.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 485

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The fifth paragraph reads as follows:

The General Conference shall not appropriate the product of the Publishing House or Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any purpose other than for the benefit of the traveling, supernumerary, and superannuated preachers, their wives, widows, and children.

I move the tentative approval of that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Section 3, first paragraph, reads:

The General Conference shall meet in the month of May once in four years perpetually, at such times and places as shall be fixed by the preceding General Conference or by a commission to be appointed quadrennially by the General Conference; and the commission shall have power to change the place, a majority of the general superintendents concurring.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: That is very awkward. It seems to allow the General Conference to fix the time and the place, that the General Conference could fix each time one place. The question is twofold. The first is whether each General Conference shall have the privilege of fixing the time of the next, and this paragraph seems to mean that.

Edgar Blake: No, the Commission fixes that.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Will the Commission have the power to fix the time and place?

Edgar Blake: Yes, if the General Conference delegates that power to it.

A. J. Lamar: Just one suggestion. I suggest the insertion of the words "April or" just ahead of the word "May" in the second line. This General Conference will sometimes meet far in the South when the days in April are much more pleasant than the days in May.

By unanimous consent an "s" was added to the word "month" and the words "April or" inserted just before the word "May" in the second line.

Edgar Blake: That allows leeway.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Edgar Blake: The second paragraph of Section 3. reads as follows:

The general superintendents may, by a majority vote, and shall, when requested by a majority of the Annual Conferences, call a special session of the General Conference.

I move the tentative adoption of this paragraph.

The motion was seconded.

David G. Downey: I think this ought to require two-thirds.

Bishop Candler: If I were on the carpet, I would say a majority was too narrow.

By unanimous consent "two-thirds" was inserted in place of "a majority."

A. J. Lamar: If we have it a majority of the Annual Conferences, why not have it a majority of the bishops? If you put two-thirds in one place, it ought to be put in the other.

Edgar Blake: I don't think the two things are on the same footing at all. I move the tentative approval of this paragraph with the change to two-thirds instead of a majority as agreed to by unanimous consent.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: The third paragraph of this section is as follows:

When the time for the opening of the General Conference has arrived, one of the general superintendents designated by the Board of Bishops shall take the chair and conduct the opening devotions of the session. Following the devotions, he shall direct the secretary of the preceding General Conference, or in his absence one of his assistants, to call the roll of the delegates elect. The general superintendents, before the General Conference convenes, shall elect from their own number one bishop, or not more than three, to preside during the session. The General Conference, upon organization, shall elect such other officers as shall be necessary.

Bishop Cooke: I think we should give some of our attention to that last part.

Edgar Blake: I think so, too.

Bishop Cooke (reading): "The general superintendents before the General Conference convenes shall elect from their own number one bishop, or not more than three, to preside during the session"—that is, this man or these three men shall preside in the entire session. I suppose the Lord Almighty has created some physical giants like Atlas so that they could bear the world on their shoulders, but I doubt if any three men could preside during an entire session of a General Conference without great danger to the whole body. The wear and tear on the nerves of the three men would be awful. Then, again, I am opposed to oligarchies anywhere. I am opposed to an episcopal oligarchy. Some people have been afraid of the Judicial Council lest at the trials there might be about three men controlling and directing the policies of the Church. We all know how easy it is for a bishop to direct the trend of things in a General Conference. It is conceivable how a bishop favorable to a certain policy might recognize men who he knows are in favor of that policy; and while he may allow one here and there on the opposite side, yet at the same time unconsciously he will pick out the men he knows

are favorable to that policy, and how easy it would be for three bishops under the influence of some other bishop themselves to direct and say to themselves, we will try to put that through!

Edgar Blake: I would like to see them try it.

Bishop Cooke: You wouldn't know it. You are not a mind reader. Infinite wisdom does not come out anywhere. There are men just as keen as we are and just as subtle in ways of doing things—

John F. Goucher: We do not need confessions here.

Bishop Cooke: I do everything so plain and open that I do not have any need of that. I think I would be above suspicion in that respect.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Brethren, we are not making any headway. Go ahead.

Bishop Cooke: I want you, Mr. Chairman, to keep order and see that we have order while I am discussing this important matter. I do not want to talk to a body of men when all of them are talking. I am opposed to this part of this section. I do not think that we can have a large body of bishops presiding, but I do think it should be left to the bishops themselves to select men from their whole number who, in their judgment, would be qualified to handle a big General Conference, and then again I want you to think of the implication of the situation. Here are three men. Evidently I can't get the attention of the floor, and I will retire.

Bishop Candler: Why abandon the old Methodist rule?

Edgar Blake: That brings the whole matter out. I am not sure that this question limiting the number to three is a wise one, and I do not think the committee is satisfied that that is exactly right. But the question has been asked why the old Methodist rule did not obtain, why the bishops, as our constitution provides, should not preside in order, and I understand your bishops preside the same way. Now, there are two or three objections to that. In the first place, in the re-organized Church we shall have thirty-two bishops. In all probability the number will increase as the Church grows and the work becomes more oppressive.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What about the bishops abroad?

Edgar Blake: I said thirty-two. There are thirty-seven now, and the chances are that the number will have to be increased so that you do not have sessions enough in your General Conference to provide that every bishop shall get a turn. Then presiding in a General Conference, as Bishop Cooke has indicated, is not every man's business. I say frankly that we have very great distress and disturbance in our own General

Conference. It has been charged sometimes to the unwieldiness of the body. I have only been in four General Conferences, and I have seen some weird things in those General Conferences, and I do not think we have witnessed one of those outbreaks that was due to the body rather than to the bishop presiding. The facts are that there are some bishops who have no talent for that sort of thing, and some bishops, instead of adding to or assisting in the orderliness of the procedure, simply produce endless confusion. Let me give you a case. I was in an Annual Conference, and the bishop presiding or conducting said: "Whom will you have for your secretary?" One member said: "I will nominate John Smith." Another said: "I will nominate John Jones." The bishop said: "Are there any further nominations?" And there were none. Then the bishop said: "I heard the name of John Smith mentioned first. All those in favor of John Smith will signify and all those opposed to him will signify it, and John Smith is elected." Think of putting a man of that type up to preside over a General Conference! But we did it. We put him up to preside over a General Conference, and we had the most disagreeable things you ever witnessed, did we not, Dr. Downey?

David G. Downey: We sure did.

Edgar Blake: I say this after careful observation. We have twenty-five bishops in our Church, and I don't think after going over the entire list that more than five bishops out of our entire twenty-five are competent to preside over a great deliberative body like our General Conference; and to put everybody up to preside over that body of men who previous to their election we never would have thought of allowing to preside over an Annual Conference is something that will jeopardize the orderly proceedings of the entire body.

Bishop Cooke: I offer the following amendment: After the words "shall elect" insert the following, "from time to time one of their number to preside during the sessions," so that the whole section will read: "The general superintendents before the General Conference convenes shall elect from time to time one of their number to preside during the session."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You mean the general superintendents?

Bishop Cooke: The general superintendents shall elect from time to time one of their number.

H. M. Du Bois: Put it "appoint" instead of "elect."

Bishop Cooke: That is all right. I think what Dr. Blake has said about the inefficiency of some men to preside over a large body is true. Every man is not competent to manage

a large body, but that matter could be safely intrusted to the Board of Bishops. They would be acquainted with the limitations of their members. And think of the picture of three men selected out of the whole body of bishops and the rest of the bishops arrayed on the platform. It would be a condemnation of every one of them, and there might be half a dozen men on that Board of Bishops just as competent as the three men chosen; but they would all fall under the general condemnation of incompetency.

Bishop Candler: I think I can make a suggestion that will meet with approval. I suggest the amendment: "The bishops shall elect from their own number one bishop from each Regional Conference, etc."

Bishop Cooke: I think that is very much better.

David G. Downey: There might come a complication in that. That may be just the thing you don't want to put in, and I hope that won't be pressed and that you will take my suggestion or the suggestion of Bishop Cooke that the General superintendents before the General Conference convenes shall elect from their own number one or more bishops to preside during the session.

Bishop Cooke: At first I gave consent to Bishop Candler's amendment, but at this moment there come to me reasons why I could not consent to that.

Bishop Candler: It is tentative.

Bishop Cooke: I see objections to it, so I will present my amendment before the house.

J. H. Reynolds: I desire to second Dr. Downey's amendment.

Edgar Blake: I think our presiding officers ought to be selected from the entire body of bishops without any restrictions whatever, and it is very easy to conceive that there may be some Regional Conferences which might have two men who would make superior presiding officers, and I can conceive of some areas having bishops none of whom were gifted in this particular line of work. If you want to change it, I think it would be better to make a rule such as Bishop Cooke indicates: "The general superintendents shall elect from their own number one or more members to preside during the sessions."

H. M. Du Bois: I desire to second Bishop Cooke's amendment and cite a bit of history. I very earnestly stood out against this proposition in the committee. I felt that it would not be approved by the Commission, and this is exactly the principle for which I contend, that the matter of the presidency should be left to the bishops themselves.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : What is the difference between Dr. Blake's suggestion and Bishop Cooke's?

Dr. Blake: I thought mine was about the same as Dr. Cooke's.

E. C. Reeves: I don't care which way this goes, when the brothers get down South we will attend to it all right. At Memphis at the General Conference we had a bishop presiding, and he made a ruling, and some one said: "Why, Mr. President, the same matter was involved yesterday, and Bishop Haygood decided otherwise," and he will be sustained or he will be reversed as he ought to be. We will have no trouble about that.

Bishop Candler: It is a good thing to remove any possible jealousy. It may not be known to you that the bishops who are competent are within a particular jurisdiction; but if they should all fall in some section, you would have some feeling that that would not be promotive of Christian perfection.

John F. Goucher: I desire to relieve the Board of Bishops from the temptation to gratuitously bring forward members of their own number who are known to be deficient in the qualities necessary. I am in favor of the amendment last read by Dr. Blake for this reason: We shall have in the near future bishops for China. There is already a Japanese bishop. Now, as there will necessarily be a limitation, that limitation should not be accidental or adventitious. In planning for efficiency we should by all means ask the bishops to pick out a limited number that would remove jealousy to a large extent. It is almost unthinkable, but it is a fact that persons who are least qualified for performing services are frequently called upon to perform them. I am not much of a musician, but in congregational services I have frequently endeavored to sing.

Bishop Candler: I have noticed that.

John F. Goucher: A person with a fine tenor voice should not undertake to sing bass, and a person with a high bass voice shouldn't essay tenor. I am heartily in favor of the amendment of Dr. Blake because it would relieve us of a great deal of embarrassment, and it would be very much more easily performed by the bishops.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Blake was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston) : Now, we have the original section with the amendment just adopted so that it in effect stands in this manner: "Shall elect from their number one bishop or more to preside." Now, I would have no objection to allowing the Regional Conferences to name a presiding officer for any succeeding day to their delegates; but not

being able to anticipate how these regional bishops will justify expectations, not being able to anticipate the construction of the Regional Conferences in the future, we might run against difficulties if we provide that the presiding officers must come in successive days from the Regional Conferences. I think we are perfectly safe the way it is now, and I think this is the proper way to leave it.

J. W. Van Cleve: It will be perfectly possible for the bishops themselves if they see proper to do so to make their choice on the basis indicated. If you give them the privilege of selection of one or more of their number, leaving it indefinite, they have quite as much liberty as needed. I think there is a little danger in the suggestion of one bishop from each Regional Conference. That may seem to prejudge something that is yet tentative. I think the form of this resolution as given to us by the committee is the best form in which it can be adopted.

Edgar Blake: We have a number of important matters to come before us, and I move, if we are going to have much more discussion on this, that we recommit it.

Bishop Candler: O no. Take a vote on my amendment.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Bishop Candler was lost, and a further vote being taken, the section as amended by Dr. Blake was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: The next section is on voting. Section 4, Paragraph 1:

The ministerial and lay delegates shall deliberate as one body and, except as otherwise provided, shall vote as one body, by a show of hands; but each delegate shall have the right to have his vote or refusal to vote recorded by name on the journal.

I move the tentative approval of this paragraph.

The motion was seconded.

A. J. Lamar: I move to amend by striking out the words "a show of hands." Let them vote as they think proper.

Edgar Blake: I will accept that amendment. We don't care for that.

A vote being taken, the paragraph as amended by the elision of the "show of hands" was adopted.

Edgar Blake: Paragraph 2 reads as follows:

One-fifth of either order of delegates present and voting may require a vote by orders, in which case it shall require the concurrence of the two orders to decide the matter under consideration, except as hereinafter provided.

It was intended to provide that on constitutional questions a two-thirds vote of the General Conference present and voting should be necessary to make the recommendation. Of course unless we do that, unless we make that provision, it.

would be possible for a proposed amendment to be held up, and for that reason we suggest the following addition: "Except that for changes of the constitution a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference present and voting shall be sufficient, as provided in Article —," which will be the Article on Amendments.

C. M. Bishop: Where does that come in?

Edgar Blake: Right at the end, "Except as hereinafter provided," and then we add: "Except that for changes of the constitution a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference present and voting shall be sufficient, as provided in Article —."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is that word "order" sufficiently definite?

Edgar Blake: I think that is the word that is used now.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What about calling for a separate vote by Regional Conferences?

Edgar Blake: That is provided for in a later paragraph, No. 4, Subsection No. 4.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to, and, a further vote being taken, the paragraph was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: Subsection 3 reads as follows:

One-half of those present and voting may require that a "Yea" and "Nay" vote be taken, in which case the chairman of each delegation, when called, shall announce the vote of his delegation and at the same time shall hand to the secretary the names of those voting for and against the proposed measure, and they shall be recorded in the journal accordingly.

Bishop Candler: Why should we depart from the universal practice, as far as I know, of all legislative bodies, of one-fifth—the object of a yea and nay vote is the protection of the minority—to put the majority on record? If you make it half, the minority never can avail itself of any such privilege. Why should we go contrary to every State in the Union and all books on parliamentary practice, which allow one-fifth to order a yea and nay vote? Why should we make it one-half? I move an amendment by striking out the word "one-half" and inserting the word "one-fifth."

A vote being taken, the amendment was carried.

Secretary Harris: I move to amend by striking out the part that relates to the method by which the vote shall be taken. It seems to me that that is inappropriate as part of the constitution. It is altogether possible and probable that in a few years votes will be taken by electrical machinery.

J. W. Van Cleve: A further consideration: the very thing desired by the amendment offered by Bishop Candler will be much more thoroughly satisfactory if each man stands and answers to his name.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): At our General Conferences when I was to preside the following day it occurred to me that we could get along much faster by taking it as provided in this way. The vote was taken and the roll of the ayes and noes passed to the Secretary of the General Conference, and in that way we saved time. The General Conference was not detained by calling eight hundred names.

W. N. Ainsworth: That is quite true, but we would still be left with the choice of doing that way if we see fit to do so.

Edgar Blake: There were some of the committee who felt quite as Dr. Harris. Many of us feel that this is really a matter that should not go into the constitution.

John M. Moore: I second the motion made by Dr. Harris.

The Chairman (Bishop Candler): That would strike out all after the word "taken" in the second line.

Edgar Blake: That is right.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Harris was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: I now move the tentative adoption of this paragraph as amended.

The motion being seconded and a vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Edgar Blake: Subsection 4 reads as follows:

Whenever a majority of each of the two regional delegations shall so request, a vote shall be taken on any pending motion or resolution, except amendments to the Constitution by regional delegations, and it shall require the concurrence of a majority of the regional delegations, the members thereof voting as one body, to adopt said motion or resolution; provided, however, that no motion or resolution shall be adopted that does not receive also a majority vote of the members of the General Conference present and voting.

I move the tentative adoption of that.

Bishop Cooke: You could drop out that word "any" in the third line.

R. E. Blackwell: No, the record as read is correct.

The motion to adopt tentatively being seconded and a vote being taken, it was carried.

Edgar Blake: Section 5, on the subject of "Quorum," reads as follows:

Two-thirds of the members elected to the General Conference shall be necessary for a quorum, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and at the final session may approve the journal, order and record the final roll call, and adjourn.

I think this section should be recommended to the committee for further consideration, for really this ought not to be approved until we know where we are.

David G. Downey: And I hope we will call to their atten-

tion the provision for amendment found in the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church as to the first restrictive rule.

Edgar Blake: I move that this article, together with the article referred to by Dr. Downey, be recommitted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

F. M. Thomas: I have a resolution. I don't know where it ought to go in the constitution, but it ought to be tentatively adopted and a place found for it. I will give my reason if I can get a second to it. It reads:

Resolved, That no Annual or Regional Conference shall consider or adopt any resolution or other action in criticism or censure of the proceedings or acts of any other Conference.

The resolution was seconded.

E. C. Reeves: I move that be the sense of this body and that we instruct them to that effect.

F. M. Thomas: I think that ought to be in there somewhere, and I will give you my reasons. We have a widely scattered country, now becoming somewhat more homogeneous; but occasionally I see where some State Legislature has in bad taste and without good sense criticized the action of some other State, and it will be impossible to avoid confusion in the formative years of this reorganized Church unless we have faith in each other. I want to give you a bit of history. Two years ago the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America would have gone to pieces if the disintegration had not been checked at a meeting at Columbus two years ago. A commission of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ had assumed to speak for the Federal Council. The Federal Council referred the matter to a committee, and I happened to be on the committee at Columbus to which the matter was referred, and that committee, after considering carefully, decided that no commission created by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America should be allowed to speak authoritatively on any matter unless it had been passed upon by the Federal Council itself; and I am satisfied that we shall save a great deal of trouble if at the beginning we determine that no Regional or Annual Conference shall adopt or consider any resolution or other action in criticism or censure of the proceedings or acts of any other Conference.

C. M. Bishop: I would like to inquire about this resolution of Dr. Thomas. If it relates to Article 9, which we have not yet considered, it was moved that that be recommitted, and no vote was taken on it.

J. H. Reynolds: I move to refer the resolution of Dr. Thomas to the committee.

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 495

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A. J. Lamar: I think it is very evident that we have done about all the work that we can do, and I move that we adjourn.

H. H. White: I would ask the gentleman to withhold that just a moment. I want to make a privileged motion. I rise, if we are going to adjourn, to move a vote of thanks to the Chamber of Commerce of the city, who took us automobile riding, and to the officers and people of this Church for the use of their building and to all others who have shown courtesy to the Commission.

John M. Moore: I am just writing out such a resolution.

H. H. White: Then I withdraw mine.

John M. Moore: I offer the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THANKS.

Resolved, That we hereby express to the Methodists of Traverse City our appreciation of the various courtesies extended to the Commission and to the individual members thereof during our stay in this city. We make special mention of the very great kindness of the pastor, official members, and the congregation of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church in putting at our service for all hours of the day and late into the night their commodious and well-appointed church and its various rooms and auditorium. The caretaker of the Church has been untiring in his labors and attentions to make us comfortable and to provide for us all needed conveniences.

We tender a vote of thanks to the city officials for the offer of the use of the council chamber. We would also express our very great appreciation of the delightful automobile ride on Saturday to Mission Pier by the Chamber of Commerce of the city.

JOHN M. MOORE,
H. N. SNYDER,
J. H. REYNOLDS.

The resolution was seconded and, being put to a vote, was adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That moves me to say a word personally. I was made quite aware on the first day of our meeting of some disappointment in that so small a place with so few attractions had been selected as our place of meeting.

W. N. Ainsworth: It is all gone now.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There was some responsibility on the Chairman of the Commission, but I have been able as I observed you from day to day to comfort myself more and more in the degree of satisfaction which I have found manifested with the climate and with the facilities which we have had for the transaction of business without the irritation of hot weather to go forward for the service at hand, and I want to thank you for your hearty appreciation of the

services I have rendered the Commission and the Churches in leading you to this place; and if you want to come again I am in the neighborhood, make use of me in any way you can, and I am going to take pleasure in going South the next time. I will go to Brownsville or Savannah or New Orleans or anywhere else you brethren desire. I put the whole matter up to Bishop Candler. Bishop Candler was influenced somewhat as to this place by the consideration that we would not be bothered by reporters.

C. M. Bishop: I think we should go farther and make a substantial contribution to the caretaker of this building.

David G. Downey: That will be covered by the Secretaries.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I am sorry that we are going to adjourn when we have three or four hours yet.

F. M. Thomas: I offer the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That the Secretaries be authorized to pay the secretarial and stenographic expenses involved in the services of the Joint Commission."

The resolution was seconded and, being put to a vote, was agreed to.

P. D. Maddin: We have been working on these reports, particularly one on Conferences, and there have been so many changes and modifications made that our copies are in very imperfect form, and in order to keep us informed as to what it is I think it would be well that as early as is convenient the Secretaries have printed all reports tentatively approved and not acted upon and all matters not reported and send four copies to each member of the Commission.

A. J. Lamar: We really don't know what has been done.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Secretaries were instructed to prepare copies of the action taken and of the matters not acted upon.

A. J. Lamar: What did we do with the janitor?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That was attended to. I was about to bring to your attention matters that should be brought before you before adjournment.

Secretary Harris: I wonder if we have not confused the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the action of the Joint Commission. Our Commission ordered me to pay a proper amount to the janitor.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Joint Commission has taken care of him.

C. M. Bishop: I move that the Secretaries be ordered to pay the caretaker, the amount to be left to the Secretaries.

A. J. Lamar: I am willing to pay out what we have to pay, but I want to know the amount.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Commission from

our Church would feel that we ought to be allowed to pay the local expenses.

A. J. Lamar: No, we want to share equally with your Commission in paying janitor and everything else.

John M. Moore: I ask Bishop Candler as Chairman of the Southern Commission to recognize me, and I move that we pay our part of everything.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote by Bishop Candler as Chairman of the Southern Commission, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now the amounts can be agreed upon by Dr. Lamar and Dr. Harris. And now, as Chairman of the Commission on the Status of the Negro, we have not been satisfied with the report presented. We think it was worded to as good advantage as possible under the circumstances controlling such affairs, but we can hardly call it a report. We have all felt, if not disappointed with ourselves, at least a good degree of dissatisfaction with the result of our work. Whether that committee could be reconstructed in such fashion as to do more effective work I am not prepared to say. I am, however, ready to say that if in the judgment of the Joint Commission there could be a readjustment or a rearrangement or reconstruction of that committee it would afford me a good deal of satisfaction to be relieved from it and have the whole work put in other hands, so that an agreement could be reached. What we presented was about as near an agreement as that committee could reach, even if they had had more time. If it is your pleasure in view of the situation to create a new committee, I am sure that none of us would feel that we have been mistreated.

Bishop Candler: I hope no new committee will be created. We will trust these brethren. They have been considering the question, and another committee would have to start *de novo*.

T. N. Ivey: I move that we take up the regular order of procedure and consider the report of the Judicial Council.

The motion, being seconded, was put to a vote and carried.

P. D. Maddin: I move that we continue this session until half-past one o'clock and finish up what work we can. A great many are desirous of leaving at three o'clock, and we couldn't do anything at all in an afternoon session if we adjourned at the usual time; so I move that we continue until half-past one o'clock.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A. J. Lamar: There is a question of personal privilege involving a motion to adjourn. Part of that was personal and

498 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

part was not. I thought it would be better for this Commission to adjourn with two items of business not attended to than with only one, the status of the negro. I thought it best to leave the Judicial Council with that also. The other reason was personal, and we have indulged in a good many personal privileges connected with the question of leaving. If this Commission adjourns before the close of banking hours today, I can start home to-night. If it does not, I cannot start home until to-morrow night, and I will be left here by myself. Also I formed the habit early in life of taking something to eat about three times a day.

Bishop Candler: I believe there is another reason in addition to that. Our body is depleted. Yours is also somewhat. If my count is right, there are eighteen members present of the Commission from the Methodist Church, South, and there are fifteen on the other side.

Charles W. Kline: No, two of those have gone.

Bishop Candler: Then you are down to thirteen. It takes thirteen to be a majority of each Commission; and if we pass something by a vote of seven to six, seven men are speaking for the Commission of twenty-five. I don't think we are competent to pass on important matters in that manner.

David G. Downey: I renew the motion that after proper devotional exercises the Commission do now stand adjourned.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): And the reading of the Journal?

David G. Downey: Yes.

John F. Goucher: I have a motion, and that is that we postpone the consideration of the Committee on Judicial Council and the report of the General Committee concerning general benevolent matters and the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro to the next meeting.

W. J. Young: I want to amend there by referring the report on the status of the negro back to the committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think the vote on the motion to recommit comes first.

The motion to recommit being seconded and a vote being taken, it was carried.

Edgar Blake: I think we should recommit the report on Judicial Council also.

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

T. N. Ivey: I will simply say this, that I cannot appreciate the force of Bishop Candler's remarks that there are so few now that it wouldn't do for us to take up the consideration of the Judicial Council. We should have had just as many as when we considered some other important questions con-

nected with the General Conference this morning. I cannot conceive of any reason why, after that committee has made its report, in view of the fact that we still have two hours in which to consider matters, we should adjourn without a consideration of that question. Whenever we are attacking a citadel and there are three lines of defenses, when we know that we have attacked and captured two lines, there will be greater encouragement to proceed with the rest. I believe that this Commission has agreed on two of the great questions, and that will be a great advantage to us, and I cannot see why under these circumstances, although we are tired, we should adjourn without the consideration of those questions. I have risen to a question of personal privilege simply to state my views on that question. The brethren who left said they would be willing to trust the interest of these questions to be considered in the hands of those who are left, and under the circumstances I may be the only one, but I shall vote against adjournment.

Bishop Candler: I do not want to interrupt any speaker, but I think Brother Downey's motion is scarcely susceptible of debate.

The Chairman(Bishop Cranston): This is not a debate on Brother Downey's motion. Brother Downey was unwilling to press his motion when other members were saying something in justification of their faith.

E. B. Chappell: Evidently we cannot exhaustively discuss that report, but it might help if we were to adopt this first statement that the Judicial Council shall be the final court of appeals whose decision shall be final.

David G. Downey: And there is another clause: "Except as otherwise provided."

F. M. Thomas: Have not these reports been referred back? and are they the subject of discussion now?

David G. Downey: I renew my motion to adjourn after the reading of the Journal.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Cooke: If these reports are referred back, I would like to make an announcement while the brethren are all here which I would like for the Commission of the Church, South, to agree to, and that is that the Committee on Judicial Council shall meet a day before the next session of the Commission to have the power to call them—

Edgar Blake: The next meeting is probably the final meeting that we shall have before the meeting of the General Conference of the Church, South, in May. There have been some—I will not say criticisms—suggestions on some of the re-

ports. Men have said that they could not consider some of the questions involved in the report because they had not had sufficient time to weigh them. I think all these committees should get together at as early a date as possible and should formulate their reports and send them out to the members, so that we can have them in possession in advance of the meeting.

David G. Downey: I hope that Dr. Blake will put that in the form of a motion. I think it is highly important that that should be done.

Edgar Blake: To what date did we adjourn?

F. M. Thomas: The 23d of January.

Edgar Blake: I move that the committees be instructed to have their reports ready for distribution among the members of the Commission by January 1 and that the same be sent out not later than that date.

David G. Downey: I second the motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion is entertained by unanimous consent.

E. B. Chappell: I have heard nothing said as to what we are going to do in regard to the publication of the proceedings.

F. M. Thomas: That is already provided for.

Edgar Blake: Was the printing of the stenographer's report provided for?

E. B. Chappell: The last time we passed a resolution for the publishing of the stenographic report.

C. M. Bishop: The motion made by Dr. Blake by unanimous consent has not been put yet.

A vote being taken, the motion of Dr. Blake was carried.

E. B. Chappell: I want to inquire as to whether you want the stenographer's report published or not. I do not care anything about it myself, but I would like to know what is to be done.

F. M. Thomas: You have ordered the printing of the minutes, and the meeting at Baltimore was a kind of a talkfest and occupied a large space. This time I think we have been pretty well occupied in doing business, and we have done business, and it seems to me that for the present purposes at least the printing you have ordered will cover all our necessities.

David G. Downey: I think we ought to have for our guidance just what we have done here in our joint proceedings, not only for ourselves, but for historical purposes in the future. It will be a great mistake if we do not publish it all.

F. M. Thomas: We have sufficient copies so that each committee can have a copy. The stenographer's report will be

available for the use of each Commission, and I don't think there is any necessity for printing the entire thing.

David G. Downey: To get the matter before us I move that the proceedings of the Joint Commission, including the stenographer's report, be printed just as they were with respect to the Baltimore meeting and two copies furnished to each Commissioner.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That includes the reference to every man's speeches to him for revision.

John M. Moore: I believe it would be wise to defer the publication of the stenographic report until we have held the next meeting. We have transacted part of our business at this time, and we haven't concluded our work. I think it would be much better if we wait until we have concluded the work and then have all the proceedings printed in one volume. I do not believe the separate publication would be of any special value to us now. I admit that there will be a historic value to it, but I think we should delay the publication until after the next meeting. The price of printing and paper is awfully high now.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Understand that we are not allowing business to be transacted now except by unanimous consent.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Well, nobody is objecting.

F. M. Thomas: I think the suggestion of Dr. Moore is very wise. There is an immense amount of labor in editing these speeches. I think it would be well to complete our work at Savannah and then print the two together and that for the present the printing of the minutes with the report will cover all the ground.

Edgar Blake: I am quite certain that the speeches that have been made here are just as informing as those that were made at Baltimore. If the amount has not been as great as at Baltimore, the labor in connection with the publication will not be as great. I do not want to burden Dr. Thomas and Dr. Harris, but the value of these stenographic notes will not be as great after the Commission has done its work as they are now. For myself, I desire that I may refresh my mind on these matters between now and the coming session. For instance, there has been much discussion on this report of the Committee on Conferences, and some items in that report have been recommitted for consideration, and it will be of great value to us if we can have the benefit of the notes of the stenographer in order that we may know just what the members have said and what their minds were on this mat-

ter. I think the notes should be printed before the next meeting.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have ordered the printing of the minutes.

F. M. Thomas: If that is the mind of the Joint Commission, in order to save labor and save expense of printing them, don't print two sets.

J. W. Van Cleve: I was wondering if this wouldn't be a proper amendment: To print all the reports of committees and subcommittees that relate to actual business. I will move that as an amendment.

The amendment was seconded.

Edgar Blake: I hope you will not do that.

A vote being taken, the amendment was lost.

A further vote being taken on the motion to print the stenographic notes, the motion was carried.

J. R. Pepper: I think it is eminently proper that we should omit the printing of the minutes now because it will all be embraced in this one volume; therefore I move that we reconsider the vote by which we directed the Secretary to print the minutes.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I should think that the printing of the full stenographic report, which would include the minutes, would cover the other matter too. We will now have the reading of the minutes.

The minutes of this session were then read and approved.

Bishop Cooke: I rise for information. The motion to refer back to the committee—what is the meaning of the word "committee" there?

F. M. Thomas: "The respective committees" was the expression.

Bishop Cooke: It does not mean to the Joint Committee?

F. M. Thomas: No.

J. W. Van Cleve: I think some of us ought to know what we are to do before we adjourn. We ought to know whether the joint committees are to meet or not. I would like to know.

John F. Goucher: I moved that these reports be postponed until the next meeting of the Joint Committee. Dr. Blake made an amendment that certain reports be submitted, and I accepted that in lieu of my motion. The Committee on General Reference had not reported, and that report is still in the hands of that committee.

A. W. Harris: If I have consent, I would like to introduce a motion which has to do with the order of business. I move that when the call for the next meeting is sent out

Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification 503

the members be requested to arrange for a session of two weeks.

This motion was seconded.

Bishop Candler: I would suggest that you make the notice "at least two weeks."

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Hymn No. 210, "Glorious Things of Thee Are Spoken," was then sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Dr. Stuart will lead us in prayer.

Charles M. Stuart: We bow before thee for a moment, O God, our Heavenly Father, to render thanks unto thee for the manifold mercies vouchsafed us in coming together at this place. We thank thee for the fellowship of this time. We thank thee for the friendships that have been formed here to continue, we hope, the remainder of our lives, and we thank thee for this work that has been done here and for the hopes that have been inspired in us since coming here that the work that has been given to us will be successfully accomplished through the blessings of the most high God, and we pray thee, our Heavenly Father, that as we separate thou wilt go with us. Watch over and protect those who have already gone, and let thy blessings be manifested by multiplied bounties upon the Church we love. Increase us, we beseech thee, both in faith and strength, so that through all the coming years the Church will be a fountain of joy and of strength to the whole world. We bless thee for the pleasure thou hast given us in the work that thou hast called us to do. O blessed Lord God, help us in the days to come to be more faithful and more truthful and to be more useful in the work that the Church has given us to do, so that her influence, helpful and healthful, may go out to the ends of the earth; and so, our Father, receive us into thy care and give to us a sense of thy presence and fellowship all the days of our life, and at the end receive us into the Church triumphant, to the praise and the glory of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I feel sure that you have listened to all the talks that have been brought before you. I am sure that we have together enjoyed the grace by which we were first brought into the kingdom, that we have renewed our appreciation of all the hallowed memories out of which our Church was born and in which it has grown under the leadership of God, and I sincerely believe that we separate with the one prayer that God shall guide and govern our future communion, so that what we have had of grace and goodness and fellowship will increase and that all our work may

504 *Proceedings of the Joint Commission on Unification*

finally and ultimately tend to the greater triumph of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. I go home more confident than ever that he is leading us.


Bishop Cranston then pronounced the benediction.

Bishop Candler then announced that Savannah had been selected as the next meeting place.

The Joint Commission then adjourned.

**THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT**

**This book is under no circumstances to be
taken from the Building**



Form 410



